

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. I. *New Series.*

JULY 1859.

PART II.

THE TEXT OF THE RHEIMS AND DOUAY VERSION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

IN attempting to trace the history, and to ascertain the present state, of the text of the Rheims and Douay version of Holy Scripture, we cannot avoid availing ourselves of the elaborate work recently published by a dignitary of the Irish Establishment on the subject. We allude to Archdeacon Cotton's *Attempt to show what has been done by Roman Catholics for the Diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in English*, published at the Oxford University Press in 1855.

Not that it needs any apology for using the investigations of a learned Protestant, or for feeling grateful to him, so far as he has anticipated the necessity of researches of our own, by such minute, exact, and persevering diligence as he has taken in a subject-matter which could not be of any the slightest personal interest to himself. But, painful as it is to say it, in spite of his stating in his preface, that "the design of his book is not controversial but literary," he has made it the vehicle of so much incidental insinuation, sometimes unfair, sometimes ignorant, always ill-natured, to the disadvantage of Catholic ecclesiastics, that we are unable to regard him with that unmixed respect, and to use him with that ready and unfaltering confidence, which would be natural in those who, like ourselves, have long known his claims, both as a gentleman and a scholar, on public estimation. Perhaps, however, it is well that he should have allowed his *animus* against the Catholic Church to appear so distinctly; otherwise, from admiration of the long and patient pains with which he has prosecuted an irksome labour, we might have been led to such full reliance in his statements as it is never

right to place in any writer whatever, much less in one who, whatever his personal worth, is naturally open to the prejudices of his creed and party. As things stand, while we shall use him in the following pages, we are warned at the same time to verify his various statements, as far as may be, and where this cannot be done, not to adopt them without distinct reference to him as our authority. At the same time, in so difficult and intricate an inquiry, we have no right to anticipate that, whatever be our care, we shall succeed, whether we use him or not, in guarding against inaccuracies and errors of our own in matters of detail.

§ 1. RHEIMS AND DOUAY BIBLE.

The circumstances under which the existing Catholic translation of Holy Scripture was made are rendered familiar to us by Mr. Tierney's edition of Dod's *History*, not to refer to other authorities. The College or Seminary of Douay had been founded in 1568 by the exertions of Cardinal Allen, some time fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. A few years afterwards, its members were obliged, by the political troubles of Flanders, to migrate for a time to France, and to establish themselves at Rheims. One of their first works in the service of their countrymen was an English version of Holy Scripture. The Divines chiefly concerned in the translation of the New Testament were the aforesaid Dr. William Allen, afterwards Cardinal; Dr. Gregory Martin, of St. John's College, Oxford; Dr. Richard Bristow, of Christ Church and Exeter; and John Reynolds, of New College. Martin translated the text, and the rest revised; the Annotations were written by Bristow and Allen. Martin was also the translator of the Old Testament, the notes to which were written by Dr. Worthington, who, as Dr. Cotton says, eventually joined the Oratory. This, however, was not the case; for we find his name in Alegambe's *Script. Soc. Jes.* p. 438. He joined the Society "*ætate jam grandævus*," dying in 1626. Martin died of an illness, the consequence of his labours, in the very year in which his New Testament made its appearance.

The reasons which actuated them in their work are detailed in the Prefaces with which both Old and New Testaments are introduced to the reader. "Now since Luther's revolt also," says the preface to the New Testament, "diverse learned Catholics, for the more speedy abolishing of a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sects, and for the better preservation or reclaim of many

good souls endangered thereby, have published the Bible in the several languages of almost all the principal provinces of the Latin Church, no other books in the world being so pernicious as heretical translations of the Scriptures, poisoning the people under colour of divine authority, and not many other remedies being more sovereign against the same (if it be used in order, discretion, and humility) than the true, faithful, and sincere interpretation opposed thereunto. . . . We, therefore, having compassion to see our beloved countrymen, with extreme danger of their souls, to use only such profane translations and erroneous men's mere fantasies, for the pure and blessed word of truth, much also moved thereunto by the desires of many devout persons, have set forth for you, benign readers, the New Testament to begin withal, trusting that it may give occasion to you, after diligent perusal thereof, to lay away at least such their impure versions as hitherto you have been forced to occupy."

The preface to the whole Bible speaks to the same effect: "Now since Luther and his followers have pretended that the Catholic Roman faith and doctrine should be contrary to God's written word, and that the Scriptures were not suffered in vulgar languages, lest the people should see the truth, and withal these new masters corruptly turning the Scriptures into diverse tongues, as might best serve their own opinions, against this false suggestion and practice, Catholic pastors have, for one especial remedy, set forth true and sincere translations in most languages of the Latin Church."

The translation was made, as we have noticed, soon after the establishment of the college; but, owing to a "lack of means," as the preface says, in their "poor estate in banishment," "to publish the whole in such sort as a work of so great charge and importance" required, it "lay by them," the New Testament till 1582, the Old till 1609-10. At these dates the versions of the New and Old Testaments were respectively published in quarto; that of the New at Rheims, that of the Old at Douay, whither they returned in the course of the year. The Old Testament came to a second edition (quarto) in 1635, without alterations or corrections. The New Testament came to a second edition (quarto) in 1600, with some few alterations and corrections; to a third (16mo) in 1621; and to a fourth (quarto) in 1633. After these there was no new edition of either Old or New Testament for above a hundred years, when at length, in 1738, the fifth was published (folio) of the New Testament. In this reprint the spelling is modernised, and the text and an-

notations have a few verbal alterations, but in substance it is the edition of 1600 and 1633. A sixth edition of the New Testament (folio) was published fifty years afterwards (1788) at Liverpool, with the original preface and annotations, after the edition of 1738.

In 1816-1818 an edition, or editions, of the whole Bible were published in Ireland, in which, as regards the New Testament, the Rhemish text and annotations were mainly adopted. This edition was printed in different places, with duplicate sheets, and various cancels; and the Old Testament follows mainly, both in text and notes, Dr. Challoner's revision, which will be described lower down. This may be considered the seventh edition of the original Rhemish version.

An eighth edition, both text and notes, was published in New York, in octavo, in 1834, by a Protestant party, which hoped to make use of it as a weapon in controversy against Catholics. It professes to be "exactly printed from the original volume."

Such is the history of the Rheims and Douay Bible, of which there have been two editions of the Old Testament, 1609-10 and 1635, and eight (including the New York Protestant reprint) of the New, 1582, 1600, 1621, 1633, 1738, 1788, 1816-18, and 1834. This version comes to us on the authority of certain divines of the Cathedral and College of Rheims and of the University of Douay, confirmed by the subsequent indirect recognition of English, Scotch, and Irish bishops, and by its general reception by the faithful. It never has had any episcopal *imprimatur*, much less has it received any formal Approbation from the Holy See.

§ 2. DR. CHALLONER'S BIBLE.

We now come to review the labours of Dr. Challoner, Vicar-Apostolic of the London district, in the middle of last century. Before that time the need of a revision of the Rheims and Douay version had been felt and acknowledged. During the greater part of the seventeenth century, indeed, from 1635 till the first years of the eighteenth, the difficulty had not been a practical one, for no reprint was, during that long time, called for; but when, at length, the old edition was exhausted and a new one required, then the latent dissatisfaction of Catholics with the existing version showed itself, for two translations successively appeared in rivalry of the Rheims, and as substitutes for it. The former of these new translations was that of Dr. Cornelius Nary, in the year 1718; the latter, that of Dr. Witham of Douay. Of these

two translators, Dr. Nary was parish-priest of St. Michan's, Dublin; and the version which he published had the approbation of four Irish divines, of Paris and of Dublin. The translator observes of the Rheims and Douay version, that its "language is so old, the words so obsolete, the orthography so bad, and the translation so literal, that in a number of places it is unintelligible, and all over so grating to the ears of such as are accustomed to speak, in a manner, another language, that most people will not be at the pains of reading them."

An additional reason which Dr. Nary assigns for a new translation is the inconvenience of the folio or quarto size, in which the hitherto editions (excepting the third of the New Testament) had been published. "They are so bulky," he says, "that they cannot conveniently be carried about for public devotion; and so scarce and dear, that the generality of people neither have, nor can procure them for their private use."

Dr. Witham, the latter of these two translators, was president of Douay College in 1730. He too complains of the obscurity arising out of the literal renderings of the Douay translators. "They followed," he says, "with a nice exactness the Latin text, which they undertook to translate, at the same time always consulting and comparing it with the Greek, as every accurate translator must do, not to mistake the true sense of the Latin text. They perhaps followed too scrupulously the Latin, even as to the placing of the words; but what makes that edition seem so obscure at present, and scarce intelligible, is the difference of the English tongue, as it was spoken at that time, and as it is now changed and refined; so that many words and expressions, both in the translation and annotations, by length of time are become obsolete, and no longer in use."

These two translations appeared in 1718 and 1730; and in 1738, as I have said above, in spite of them, a new edition of the Rheims was published. However, though they were superseded, the force of the considerations which led to their publication seems to have been felt, and resulted in the revision of the Rheims and Douay text by Dr. Challoner in 1749 and following years. That this pious prelate, to whom the English Church is so much indebted, concurred in the dissatisfaction they felt with the text itself, is proved from the very fact of his altering it. That he recognised the justice of the complaint which they urged against the size of the Rheims and Douay, may be argued from the circumstance, that he prints his own edition, not in folio or quarto, but in 12mo.

He also agrees in what they say on the subject of the Annotations; but both his and their remarks on this point shall be introduced in an after portion of our inquiry.

The first edition of Dr. Challoner's revision was published in 1749. It consisted of the New Testament only, and professed in the title-page to be "newly revised and corrected according to the Clementine edition of the Scriptures" (the standard Vulgate). The approbation of two English divines is prefixed to the volume, but of no Bishop, which perhaps was unnecessary, considering he was a co-adjutor Bishop himself. In the next year, 1750, he published an edition of the whole Bible, including, therefore, a second edition of the New Testament. In 1752 he published a third edition of the New Testament; in 1763-4, a second edition of both Testaments, which included a fourth edition of the New. In 1772 he published a fifth edition of it; which was followed in 1777 by a sixth, according to Mr. C. Butler, and the last in the editor's lifetime; for he died of the shock caused him by Lord George Gordon's riots, and the trouble in which he was involved in consequence. This was in the beginning of 1781, when he was in his ninetieth year.

As to the alterations of text which he introduced, he has given us no preface or other notice which would serve as our informant of the principle, the source, or the extent of them. On an inspection of the text itself, we find them to be very considerable. We say so on a comparison, as regards the Old Testament, of the edition of 1750 with the Douay of 1635, in seven passages taken at random, viz. Gen. i. 1-10; Exod. xv. 1-10; Judges xiii. 1-10; 3 Kings xviii. 18-27; Job xxxviii. 30-39; Psalms cvi. 21-30; and Ezek. xxxiii. 1-10. In these passages, reckoning roughly, there are altogether 170 variations in 70 verses: 11 in the first passage, 20 in the second, 32 in the third, 35 in the fourth, 21 in the fifth, 25 in the sixth, and 26 in the seventh. The variation in the number of alterations in the several passages, compared one with another, may partly be accounted for by the varying length of the verses of which they are composed, and partly from the greater or less difficulty of translating. The principle of the alterations seems to be, that of making the text more intelligible to the reader; and, with this object, old words and old collocations are superseded by modern, and less usual ones are exchanged for those which are more in use and even familiar.

Thus, for "God also said," Challoner corrects "And God said;" for "Be a firmament," "Let there be." "It was

so," for "it was so done;" "Then Moses sung," for "Then sang Moses." For "song," "canticle;" for "to whom," "to her;" for "sicer," "strong drink." "I have not troubled," for "not I have troubled;" "call ye," for "invoke ye;" "fasten," for "compact;" "wilt," for "shalt," in the sense of simple futurity; "food," for "meat;" "give glory to," for "confess to;" "affliction," for "tribulation;" "indeed," for "certes;" "I will require his blood," for "his blood I will require;" "The word of the Lord came," for "was made;" "be converted," for "convert." There seems no desire to substitute Saxon words for Latin, for "set forth" is altered into "declare;" nor, perhaps, to approach the Protestant version, though, in fact, there often is an approach, from the editor's desire to improve the English of his own text. Thus, for "between waters and waters," he writes "the waters from the waters;" for "named Manue," he has adopted "whose name was," &c.; for "having a wife barren," "and his wife was barren;" for "the waters were quiet," "the waves were still;" for "were moved," "reeled;" for "if thou speak not that the impious may keep himself from sin," "if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way." On the other hand, there are instances in which he leaves both the Douay and Protestant versions, which agree together, for a rendering of his own. Thus for "terrible" he puts "awful;" for "fill the appetite," "satisfy the appetite;" for the inverted sentence "his blood will I require," "I will require his blood."

At the same time, it can scarcely be denied, there do seem to be instances in which he adopts the Protestant version by preference. Thus for "the gathering of waters together," he writes "the gathering together of the waters;" for "hastened," "made haste;" for "the house of thy father," "thy father's house;" for "if Baal, follow him," "if Baal, *then* follow him;" for "till midday," "even till [until, Pr.] noon;" for "the depths have overwhelmed," "the depths have covered." And undoubtedly he has sacrificed force and richness in some of his changes; as, for instance, in his dispensing with all inversions of words, as, "his blood will I require," as already quoted; in altering "the haven of their will" of the Douay, into "the haven which they wished for;" "fill," into "satisfy;" "marvellous," into "wonderful;" "making traffic," into "doing business;" "the blast of the storm stood," in a poetical passage, into "there arose a storm of wind." It is observable that for "*our* Lord" (as in "the commandments of *our* Lord," "if *our* Lord be God," "the word of *our* Lord came," &c.) he uses "*the* Lord" *passim*.

Dr. Challoner's corrections of the Old Testament almost

amount to a new translation. They can as little be said to be made on the basis of the Douay as on the basis of the Protestant version. Of course there must be a certain resemblance between any two Catholic versions whatever, because they are both translations of the same Vulgate; but this connection between the Douay and Challoner being allowed for, Challoner's version is even nearer to the Protestant than it is to the Douay; nearer, that is, not in grammatical structure, but in phraseology and diction. We will take Psalm lii. as an example, selected at hazard; and we will go through it in the three versions, member by member, denoting the three by the initials of Douay, Protestant, and Challoner respectively.

1. The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. D. P. The fool said in his heart, There is no God. C.

2. They are corrupt. D. Corrupt are they. P. They are corrupted. C.

and become abominable in iniquities. D. C. and have done abominable iniquity. P.

There is not that doth good. D. There is none that doeth [doth C.] good. P. C.

3. God hath looked forth from heaven. D. God looked down from heaven. P. C.

upon the children of men. D. P. on the children of men. C.

to see if there be that understandeth. D. to see if there were any that did understand. P. C.

or. D. C. that. P.

seeketh after God. D. did seek God. P. C.

4. All have. D. C. Every one is. P.

of them, *omitted by* D. of them. P. C.

have declined. D. is gone back. P. have gone aside. C.

they are become unprofitable together. D. C. they are altogether become filthy. P.

there is not that doth good, no there is not one. D. there is none that doeth [doth C.] good, no, not one. P. C.

5. Shall they not all . . . know. D. C. Have . . . no knowledge. P.

that work iniquity. D. the workers of iniquity. P. C.

that devour my people as food of bread. D. who eat up my people as they eat bread. P. C.

6. God they have not invocated. D. they have not called upon God. P. C.

there have they trembled for fear. D. C. there were they in great fear. P.

where no fear was. D. P. where there was no fear. C.

because God hath dissipated the bones. D. for God hath scattered the bones. P. C.

of them that please men. D. C. of him that encampeth against thee. P.

they are [have been C.] confounded. D. C. thou hast put them to shame. P.

because God hath despised them. D. P. C.

7. Who will give out of Sion the salvation of Israel. D. C. O that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion. P.

when God shall convert the captivity of his people. D. when God bringeth [shall bring C.] back the captivity of his people. P. C. Jacob shall rejoice, and Israel shall be glad. D. P. C.

Now on this collation we observe : 1. That there is (with one exception) no instance of difference between the Douay and Protestant in which Challoner leaves the Douay but he leaves it for the Protestant. The exception is in v. 4, where, for the Douay "declined," he does not substitute the Protestant "gone back," but "gone aside."

2. Next we observe that, of the instances in which Challoner sides with the Douay against the Protestant, eight are cases of construction of the Latin, not of diction, viz. "become abominable in," v. 2, "or," v. 3, "all," v. 4, "unprofitable," *ibid.*, "shall not . . . know," v. 5, "trembled," v. 6, "please men," *ibid.*, and "who will give," v. 7.

3. Subtracting these from the nine cases in which Challoner sides with the Douay against the Protestant, we have only one remaining in which he does so freely and by his own choice, viz. "confounded" for "put to shame," v. 6.

4. It is true there are other cases in which Challoner abstains from the Protestant, but in these the Protestant agrees with the Douay. There are three of these, that is to say, three instances of the Douay siding with the Protestant against Challoner; and thus there are more instances of the Douay siding with the Protestant than of Challoner siding with the Douay.

5. On the other hand, there are ten instances in which Challoner leaves the Douay for the Protestant.

We really cannot say whether this Psalm supplies a fair instance of the general character of Challoner's Old Testament, though we have taken it at random; but, after all allowances for the accident of the selection, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Douay Old Testament no longer exists as a received version of the authorised Vulgate.

So much as to the Old Testament: as to the New, we are not in possession of Dr. Challoner's first edition (1749), but we have compared with the Rheims of 1738 (which is the edition of the New Testament immediately before his own) his third edition of 1752, correcting it back into the text of his first, by means of the collations between the editions of 1749 and 1752, which Dr. Cotton has made. We have made

the comparison in three places, taken at random : Luke viii. 1-10 ; John xiii. 6-15 ; and Heb. iv. 1-10.

In the first of these three passages there are about 21 corrections of the Rheims ; of these, 17 are adoptions of the Protestant version ; one is an alteration from the Protestant as well as the Rheims ; three agree with neither Rheims nor Protestant.

In the second passage, John xiii. 6-15, there are but seven corrections of text ; of these, at least six are made in accordance with the Protestant version, and one of these is even an insertion of a word, not in the Vulgate, which the Protestant inserts. As these changes are remarkable, we cite them. They are, "what I do," for "that which I do;" "but thou shalt know hereafter," for "hereafter thou shalt know;" "Thou shalt never wash my feet," for "Thou shalt not wash my feet for ever;" "for so I am," instead of "for I am so;" "your Lord and Master," for "Lord and Master;" "you also ought," for "you ought."

As regards the third passage, instead of a collation throughout, we will set down a few verses as a specimen :

Verse 1.

Rheims, 1738. Let us fear therefore, lest perhaps *forsaking the promise* of entering into his rest, *some* of you be thought to be wanting.

Protestant. Let us therefore fear, lest, a *promise being left* us of entering into his rest, *any* of you should seem to come short of it.

Challoner, 1749. Let us fear therefore, lest, *the promise being left* of entering into his rest, *any* of you should be thought to be wanting.

Verse 3.

Rheims. For we, that have believed, shall enter into the rest, as he said, As I *sware* in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest; and truly the works from the foundation of the world *being perfected*.

Protestant. For we which have believed do enter *into rest*, as he said, As I *have sworn* in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest : although the works *were finished* from the foundation of the world.

Challoner. For we who have believed shall enter *into rest* ; as he said, As I *have sworn* in my wrath, If they shall enter into my rest ; and this, when the works from the foundation of the world *were finished*.

Verse 6.

Rheims. Because then it remaineth that *certain* enter into it, and they, to whom *first it was* preached, did not enter because of *incredulity*.

Protestant. Seeing therefore it remaineth that *some* must enter therein, and they to whom it *was first* preached entered not in because of *unbelief*.

Challoner. Seeing then it remaineth that *some* are to enter into it, and they, to whom it *was first* preached, did not enter in because of *unbelief*.

A comparison of these verses again suggests to us some of the rules which Dr. Challoner kept in view in approximating, or not approximating, to the Protestant version. As we have said, he could not be unfaithful to the Vulgate: he never would leave its literal sense for the Protestant text, which, on the other hand, is translated from the Greek. Hence, in the contrast of the Greek *δοκῇ τις* and the Latin *existimetur aliquis*, he keeps to the Rheims; and in like manner, in *ὑστερηκένοι* as contrasted with *deesse*, and in *καίτοι γενηθέντων* with *et quibus operibus perfectis*. It is remarkable, however, that in one case, where the Rheims is with the Greek, he leaves it for the Protestant, which is not faithful to the Greek, viz. *εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν*, in *requiem*. In one case he corrects the interpretation which the Rheims gives of the Vulgate by the Protestant, *relictâ pollicitatione*. Again, one object with him was to popularise the style; hence he puts *unbelief* for *incredulity*. Hence he alters the *we that have* of the Rheims, not to the *we which have* of the Protestant, but into *we who have*. Hence, too, he retains the *enter into it* of the Rheims, where the Protestant has *enter therein*; and the *did not enter* of the Rheims, where the Protestant translates *entered not*. Yet he is not always consistent: *herein* or *therein* occurs elsewhere in his revision; and *unto* for *to* very frequently. Vide also Cotton, note. In John vi. 53 he has altered the "Unless ye eat" of the Rheims into the less accurate or obsolete Protestant rendering, "Except ye eat." Vide also John iii. 3.

We have already implied that Dr. Challoner made corrections of his own editions of the New Testament as they successively issued from the press. The second edition (1750) differs from the first, according to the collations which Dr. Cotton has printed, in about 124 passages; the third (1752) in more than 2000. These alterations, Dr. Cotton tells us, are all in the direction of the Protestant version; how far this is the case, and in what sense, the above examination of particular texts may serve to explain.

Challoner's text was the first which was published with an episcopal sanction; for it must be borne in mind that he was a Bishop, and the coadjutor of the Vicar-Apostolic of London, at the time of his first edition.

§ 3. DR. TROY'S BIBLE.

Dr. Challoner died in 1781; while he lived, no editions were published but such as followed his Revision. A few years, however, after his death, as we have noticed above, there was a return to the original Rheims of the New Testament, which was published in a sixth edition at Liverpool in 1788. But this had been preceded by an edition at Dublin; which, as being the first of a series of editions of the New Testament upon a new revision of the Rheims version, requires some distinct notice. It was made on the basis of Dr. Challoner's, but still with considerable changes of text. The revisor was the Rev. Bernard Macmahon, a Dublin priest, who published his first edition in 1783, in 12mo, with the formal approbation of his Archbishop, Dr. Carpenter. There is reason for supposing that it professed to be a continuation of Dr. Challoner's labours; for, as that venerable prelate published successively three corrected editions of the New Testament, in 1749, 1750, and 1752 (for the subsequent editions are not new corrections, but almost *fac-similes* of the preceding: vide Cotton, p. 20, &c.), so this new Dublin edition is called, in the Archbishop's approbation prefixed to it, "the *fourth* edition, revised and corrected anew." This is Dr. Cotton's conjecture also, though he accompanies it, as is not unusual with him, with a gratuitous piece of ill-nature. If "the fourth" does not mean this, it is difficult to say to what previous edition it refers; for, at the time that it was published, there had been already five editions of the Rheims. Leaving this point, we are told by Dr. Cotton that the variations from Challoner's text, in the Gospels, are about 50; in the Acts and subsequent books, above 500. Eight years afterwards, in 1791, the same clergyman was selected by Dr. Troy, his then Archbishop, to superintend an edition of the whole Bible in quarto; and on this occasion, according to the same authority, he introduced into the New Testament above 200 changes more, calling it the "fifth edition." In 1794 it was reprinted in folio, forming "the sixth;" a "seventh edition" of the New Testament was published in 12mo in 1803, with above 100 variations from the text of 1791, in favour of that of 1783; and an "eighth" in 1810, in 12mo also, after the text of the seventh.

Thus we have five editions of the revision of Mr. Macmahon, with the titles of fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth. Of these the first, fourth, and fifth are of the New Testament only; the second and third of the whole Bible. The text has also been adopted in the Philadelphian edition

of the Bible in 1805, which styles itself "the first American from the fifth Dublin edition."

If we are to follow Dr. Cotton, we ought to notice it as a peculiarity of this revision, that, whereas Dr. Challoner's alterations were in the direction of the Protestant version, those of Mr. Macmahon (or of his successors in the editorship) were in the opposite direction. We should not have been surprised at this being the case, without imputing to the English Bishop any wish to favour the translation in question, or in the Irish priest to protest against it. From the respective circumstances of the two countries, it has come about, as we are informed by those who ought to know, that the English language in Ireland has, in its diction and construction, more of a French character than in England. If this be so, the idioms and words, which each revisor would consider to be an improvement on the Rheims, would in one case approximate to the Protestant text, in the other recede from it. However, we are not sure of the accuracy of Dr. Cotton's alleged fact, nor of the actual operation, in this instance, of the principle to which we have referred it. We doubt whether Macmahon's alterations *have* a foreign cast, and we doubt whether he *is* further from the Protestant version than Dr. Challoner.

As to the character of his alterations, they are sometimes more colloquial than Challoner's, and sometimes not so English, without being foreign. Thus, the Rheims and Challoner speak of "the multitude," and the Protestant of "the people," being "put forth," when Mr. Macmahon speaks of "the crowd" being "turned out" (Matt. ix. 25). Where the Rheims translates "it shall break him to powder," the Protestant and Challoner, "it will grind him to powder," Mr. Macmahon writes, "it will dash him to pieces" (Luke xx. 18). Where the Rheims has "they were in doubt of them, what would befall," Challoner, "they were in doubt concerning them, what would come to pass," and the Protestant, "they doubted of them, whereunto this would grow," Mr. Macmahon has adopted, "they were in doubt what was become of them" (Acts v. 24). The "Barnabas would have taken with them John" of the Rheims, "Barnabas would have taken with him John" of Challoner, "Barnabas determined to take with them John" of the Protestant, is rendered by Mr. Macmahon, "Barnabas had a mind to take along with him John" (Acts xv. 37). And for "that which is the foolish of God" according to the Rheims, and "the foolishness of God" of the Protestant and Challoner, Mr. Macmahon substitutes "that which appeareth foolish of God."

We could not, then, account for the fact, supposing it to hold, that Mr. Macmahon receded from the Protestant approximations of Challoner's text, by his supposed preference of an English style less vernacular than what is in use among ourselves. However, we are not sure that the fact is as Dr. Cotton represents it. He says, "Of the passages rendered differently from Challoner, many recede much further from the authorised version than he (Dr. Challoner) did" (p. 55). We do not set our own diligence or accuracy in competition with Dr. Cotton's, still we do but state a fact when we say that our own experiments at collating the two revisions do not bear out the impression which his words convey. The edition, indeed, of the New Testament of 1783 hardly exists, and is unknown to us; but Dr. Troy's edition of 1794, which we have used, "follows the quarto Bible of 1791 exactly," says Dr. Cotton (p. 77), and the text of the Holy Bible of 1791 "is the text of Mr. Macmahon's Testament of 1783, with upwards of two hundred additional departures from Challoner" (p. 58). With this New Testament, then, of 1794 we have compared Dr. Challoner's of 1752 and the Rheims of 1621, with the following result.

In twenty instances, taken at random, we found that, while in ten of them Dr. Challoner had left the Rheims for the Protestant, and in six Mr. Macmahon (or his editorial successor) had returned from Dr. Challoner's to the Rheims; yet, on the other hand, in four, in which Dr. C. had retained the Rheims, Mr. Macmahon had adopted the Protestant; that is, on the whole, that out of *twenty* instances of variation, Dr. Challoner and Mr. Macmahon had left the Rheims for the Protestant in the same *four*; that Dr. Challoner had adopted altogether *ten* Protestant renderings, and Mr. Macmahon *eight*; that Dr. C. had kept the Rheims where Mr. M. had adopted the Protestant in *four*, and that Mr. M. had kept the Rheims where Dr. C. had adopted the Protestant in *six*.

Again, on collating the translated texts which we have mentioned with the Protestant of Hebrews xiii., we find Challoner and Macmahon have *eleven* differences from each other; in *two* Challoner leaves the Rheims for the Protestant, where Macmahon retains it, viz. in the position, &c. of words in vv. 7 and 11; in *four* Macmahon leaves the Rheims for the Protestant, where Challoner retains it, viz. "carried," 9; "now the God," &c. 20, 21; "working," 21; and "few," 22. In *three* C. retains and M. leaves both Rheims and Protestant, where the latter two agree together; and in *two* M. retains the Rheims, and C. leaves it, though not for the Protestant.

Again, in James i. there are *nine* differences between

Challoner and Macmahon; in which C. retains *three* of the Rheims, which M. changes, and C. changes into the Protestant *five* of the Rheims, which M. retains. In the *ninth* all four renderings are different from each other.

Again, in St. Jude's epistle, 1-10, out of Macmahon's *twenty-six* alterations of the Rheims, *twenty-four* are from Challoner; but in the other *two* Challoner retains the Rheims, which Macmahon leaves for the Protestant.

And in 2 Ep. St. John, out of Macmahon's *eighteen* alterations from the Rheims, *fifteen* are from Challoner, and *three* are made where C. follows the Rheims.

On the whole, then, we are not able to corroborate Dr. Cotton's remark as to Mr. Macmahon's dissatisfaction, greater or less, with the Protestant leaning of Dr. Challoner's revision of the Rheims, though it is a real perplexity to us that we should differ from him. So much as regards the New Testament. As regards the Douay translation of the Old, there seems to be very little difference between the texts of Dr. Challoner and Mr. Macmahon. We have collated seven chapters taken at random: Numb. xxiv., Deuter. i., Esther v., Psalm lxxviii., Eccclus. v., Isai. xv., and Abdias. In four of these there is not a single difference between Dr. C. and Mr. M. In Deut. i. the only difference is C.'s "unto" for M.'s "to," in verse 3. In Psalm lxxviii. the last words "unto all generations," which C. adopts after the Protestant, instead of the "unto generation and generation" of the Douay, which M. retains. In Abdias the only difference is C.'s "speak proudly" after the Protestant, where M. retains the "magnify thy mouth" of the Douay. That is, in one hundred and forty-six verses there are only three, or rather two, differences; in these Macmahon returns to the Douay, which Challoner had left for the Protestant. These collations bear out, as far as they go, Dr. Cotton's remark that "the text of this edition (the Dublin) so far as concerns the Old Testament, does not differ materially from that of Dr. Challoner's" (p. 58).

This series of editions, commenced by Mr. Macmahon's New Testament, and extending from 1783 to 1810, may be fitly called Dr. Troy's Bible, from the Approbation which he gave to it in 1791. As that Approbation sums up the history of the version hitherto, and connects his own revision with that of Dr. Challoner, a portion of it shall be given here. "By our authority," the Archbishop says in Latin, "we approve this new English edition of the Holy Bible, . . . which has by our order been carefully collated by the Rev. Bernard Macmahon with the Clementine Vulgate, also with the Douay Old Testament of 1609, and the Rheims New Testament of

1582, and with the London Old and New Testament of 1752, approved English versions."

§ 4. EDITIONS SINCE DR. TROY'S BIBLE.

Challoner's revision is the first and the last to which the Douay version of the Old Testament has been subjected; the text remains almost *verbatim* as he left it. What qualifications must be made of this statement, on the score of certain passages in Dr. Troy's Bible, shall be considered when we speak of the now current editions. The same, however, cannot be said of Challoner's New Testament, and for this reason, if for no other, that the texts of his editions vary from each other; and, moreover, as he was not the author of all the changes introduced into the later editions (for Mr. C. Butler tells us, "alterations were made in every" edition, "*to his dissatisfaction*," Cotton, p. 50), it is not wonderful that the tendency to fresh changes, which was powerful enough even in his lifetime to introduce itself, in spite of his wishes, into his own work, should have had actual results after his death. Dr. Troy's (*i. e.* Mr. Macmahon's) emendations have already been spoken of. Subsequent editors have had to choose between this or that of Challoner's three texts of the New Testament, and Dr. Troy's text; and, as might have been expected, they have chosen variously. The principal of them shall now be enumerated.

1. *Dr. Hay's Bible.*

1. In 1761 an edition of the whole Bible was printed in Edinburgh, 5 volumes, 12mo, under the inspection of Dr. Hay, one of the Vicars-Apostolic in Scotland, so well known by his publications. We introduce Dr. Hay's name on Dr. Cotton's authority, as we do not find it in our own copy, which is of the second edition.

2. In 1804-5 "the same printer (Mr. John Moir) issued a re-impression." About 3000 and 2000 copies were struck off of these two editions.

3. In 1811 a great number of unsold copies were published in Dublin with new title-pages, some engravings, and a long list of subscribers, with the imprint, "Dublin, 1811." This may be called the third edition.

4. In the same year an actual reprint of the New Testament was published by the same Dublin publisher. It also has a list of subscribers; among whom are Dr. Troy, Dr. Murray, &c.

5. In 1814 this New Testament came to a fifth edition at Dublin, in 12mo.

6. And in 1817 it probably supplied the text to the 12mo edition printed at Belfast.

Of the text of Dr. Hay's New Testament (for, as we have said, the text of the Old Testament has not substantially varied since Challoner's time), Dr. Cotton says: "It in general follows Challoner's edition of 1763-4; but occasionally it deserts that edition for the first, of 1749, as in Matt. i. 25, iii. 13, iv. 9, v. 37, vi. 16, viii. 17, x. 22, xxi. 40; Acts v. 38; Eph. i. 21, and some other places. In a few passages it agrees with Dr. Troy's Bible of 1791, as at Matt. ii. 23, iv. 9; Gal. vi. 9, &c." (p. 77).

2. *Dr. Gibson's Bible.*

1. In 1816-17 an edition of the Bible was published at Liverpool, in folio. It bore "on the title-page that it was published with his (Dr. Gibson's) sanction" (p. 110).

2. In 1822-23 a reprint of this Bible in folio was published in London.

3. In 1829 a third was published in London also, and in folio, and "very handsomely executed." It was put forth under the sanction of Dr. Bramston, then Vicar-Apostolic, and calls itself "the third edition" (*ibid.*).

It is not certain that these three editions belong to each other, though the printers and publishers of all three, and the approving Bishop of the first two, are the same, and though the last two distinctly call themselves "the second and third" respectively, if we understand Dr. Cotton (pp. 110, 127). Our reason for this remark is, that the second edition is said to be "*revised and corrected*" by two Liverpool clergymen, and that the third edition has not the same episcopal sanction as the first two.

As to the text of the New Testament, Dr. Cotton tells us that, in the edition of 1816-17, it is "taken almost without exception from Challoner's later editions;" in the third it "appears to agree with that of Dr. Challoner in 1763-4." These statements coincide.

3. *Dr. Poynter's New Testament.*

1. 1815. A New Testament was published in two sizes, "12mo and a handsome 8vo" (p. 99). It professes in the title-page to be "stereotyped from the edition published by authority in 1749," that is, from Challoner's first. It has a preliminary "Address," anonymous, but according to Mr. C. Butler, written by Dr. Poynter. "The superintendence of this edition," says Dr. Cotton, "was confided to the care of the Rev. Dr. Rigby, afterwards Vicar-Apostolic of the Lon-

don District. . . . The text," he continues, "as was above stated, agrees with that of the edition of 1749. I have only detected a single slight variation, viz. at Philipp. ii. 7." The reading of Dr. Poynter's edition, in this place, is "debased himself," taken from Challoner's text of 1752; for the reading in those of 1749 and 1750 is "emptied himself."

2. In 1818 a new edition of this New Testament was prepared by the Rev. Mr. Horrabin, under the sanction of Dr. Poynter. It was in 12mo, and was sold at a low price for the use of the poorer class.

3. In 1823 the stereotype plates of the edition of 1815 were used for an edition published by Mr. Bagster, which is still in circulation.

4. 1825. A fresh edition of Dr. Poynter's New Testament, in 8vo. Dr. Cotton tells us that it follows the edition of 1815 "both in text and notes, *with exception* of reading 'debased' *instead* of 'emptied' at Phil. ii. 7." This perplexes us; for Dr. Poynter's edition of 1815, and Bagster's from the same plates, in 1823, both of which lie before us, both read "debased" already. We have not the means of comparing the edition of 1825 with them.

5. 1826. A new stereotyped edition of Dr. Poynter's New Testament, in 12mo. It was published at Dublin, at the expense of the Commissioners of Irish Education, with the *imprimatur* of the four Archbishops of Ireland.

6. 1834, 35, 37, 40. The edition of 1826 with new title-pages (Cotton, p. 242).

7. 1842. The edition of 1825 was "reissued with a new title-page and a new printer's name" (p. 123).

4. *Dr. Troy's Bible without notes.*

1. 1820. This edition is quite distinct from the series of editions on which we have enlarged as Mr. Macmahon's revision. It is quite distinct, too, from Dr. Troy's Bible of 1816-18, which, as regards its New Testament, we have mentioned above (p. 148) as being a reprint, Text and Notes, of the Rhemish. It is remarkable for having no notes at all appended to the verses or chapters. The whole sacred text stands absolutely by itself, a supplement being added with the usual notes, which might or might not, according to the purchaser's pleasure, be bound up with it. Of this edition 20,000 copies were struck off. Dr. Troy, in his Approbation, speaks of it as "conformable particularly to the text of the Douay English version sanctioned by him, and published in 1791:" however, Dr. Cotton tells us that "the text is taken literally from that of Dr. Challoner's second edition, 1750.

and is," as he believes, "the first, if not the only, modern representation of that particular text" (p. 120).

2. 1825. Copies of the above were reissued in London with a new title-page.

5. *Dr. Murray's Bible.*

1. 1825. This edition is in 8vo, stereotyped, and its plates are still in use. There have been fresh impressions of it from time to time, in 1829, 33, 40, 44, 47, &c.

As to the text of the New Testament, "it rather follows Dr. Challoner's early editions of 1749 and 1750" (Cotton, p. 124). He adds, "The Bible appears to have given great satisfaction to the Roman Catholic public, and to have been made a sort of standard or exemplar for some editions since issued both in great Britain and Ireland."

2. 1833-36. The Glasgow Bible, 8vo, published with the Approbation of the Vicar-Apostolic of England and Scotland.

3. 1838. Dr. Blake's New Testament, 8vo, Newry, appears to adopt "the text of Dr. Murray, agreeing with the early editions of Challoner" (p. 140). It was reprinted at Belfast, 1846-47.

4. 1838. Dr. Denvir's series of reprints at Belfast of the New Testament begin apparently in 1836; Dr. Cotton sets down one under the date of 1837. Subsequent reprints, or fresh issues, are dated 1839, 41, 43, 45, and nearly every successive year; and the whole Bible in 1839, 47, &c. In another issue of Bibles his name appears in conjunction with Dr. Crolly's, in 1846, and 52.

The text of the New Testament in these editions, at least in that of 1839, "appears to agree with Dr. Murray's edition of 1825" (p. 146). We have collated Dr. Murray's text of 1825 with Dr. Denvir's of 1853, in Rom. xiii. There is a variation in verse 11, viz. "time" in edition 1853 for "season" in edition 1825. "Time" stands in Troy's edition, 1794; but the text is certainly not Troy's, from whose text in the same chapter it has the following variations: "princes" for "rulers," v. 3; "God's minister" for "minister of God," twice in v. 4; "to love" for "that you love," v. 8; and "our neighbour" for "the neighbour," v. 10.

5. 1840. At Philadelphia, U.S., a New Testament, apparently a reprint of Dr. Murray's text of 1825, with the approbation of Archbishops Kenrick and Hughes.

6. 1846. Dr. Machale's New Testament. "Both the text and notes seem to agree with Dr. Murray's Bible published in 1825" (Cotton, p. 148).

6. *Cardinal Wiseman's Bible.*

1847. This edition is printed in 8vo by Messrs. Richardson, London and Derby. It has the approbation of Dr. Walsh, Vicar-Apostolic, and Dr. Wiseman, his coadjutor. The text seems to follow Dr. Troy's of 1791, or of 1803, which inclines to Mr. Macmahon's original edition of 1783. This seems to be Dr. Cotton's account, vide pp. 78, 149. Out of twenty-seven instances of variation of text taken at random, we find none to side with Challoner against Troy, twenty-six side with Troy against Challoner, and in one the reading is without precedent, viz. in 1 John iv. 2: "Every spirit, that confesseth Jesus Christ *to come* in the flesh, is of God."

We must not conclude this enumeration of revisions and reprints of the Rheims and Douay, without giving some account of two rival folio editions, which were published (or rather sold to subscribers in parts) without direct episcopal sanction, though one of them has since risen into great reputation, and has received, first the approbation of the Vicars-Apostolic of Scotland, and of various Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, and lately that of the Archbishop of New York, where it has been republished, together with the recommendation of a great number of North-American Bishops, in letters prefixed to the edition, as well as that of our own Cardinal Archbishop and of the late Archbishop of Milan. This is Haydock's Bible, originally published at Manchester and Dublin in 1811-12 and 1814; its rival being that of Oswald Syers, published at Manchester in 1811-13. Mr. Haydock and Mr. Syers, the respective publishers, were printers; but the editor and annotator employed by the former was his own brother, who was a priest, the Rev. George Haydock, to whom the edition owes its celebrity.

7. *Syers' Bible.*

1811-13. This Bible "bears no approbation of any living ecclesiastical authority; nor any preface or other introductory matter to explain the principle adopted in this edition, or the sources from which the annotations are derived" (Cotton, p. 91). With the annotations we are not here concerned; "the text," he continues, "appears rather to agree with that of Dr. Challoner, and in the New Testament it rather follows his early editions, 1749 and 1750, than his later ones, 1752, &c." We do not think it very necessary to go to any great pains in verifying what Dr. Cotton has so diligently examined. In Phil. ii. 7 this edition follows Challoner's later

edition of 1752; otherwise our collations, as far as we have made any, lead us to agree with Dr. Cotton.

8. *Haydock's Bible.*

1. 1811-12 and 1814. The characteristic of this edition is its new and copious Annotations. As to the text, the editor professes in his advertisement his intention to "adhere to the text of the Venerable and Right Rev. Dr. Richard Challoner;" on which Dr. Cotton remarks, "it is not exactly true that Dr. Challoner's text is followed universally" (p. 87). As regards the New Testament, the justice of Dr. Cotton's remark will be plain on a very superficial examination, however the fact is to be accounted for. Out of twenty instances taken at hazard, we found Haydock's text to agree with Dr. Troy's of 1794, as against any of Challoner's texts, in eighteen; to agree with Challoner against Troy in one; and in one to differ from both.

2. 1822-24. In 1822 "an 8vo edition of Haydock's Bible with short notes was issued in Dublin; and, two years later, a new title-page was prefixed to it with the date 1824, calling itself 'the second edition.' The book is very carelessly printed, and full of errors. The text of the New Testament seems to have been taken from Dr. Troy's Bible of 1791 and 1794" (Cotton, p. 123).

3. 1845-48. "A republication of Haydock's Bible at Edinburgh and London, with all its notes, in a handsome quarto form" (*ibid.* p. 149), with the approbation of the Vicars-Apostolic of Scotland, with their coadjutors, of the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, and of the Bishops of Belfast, Waterford, and Limerick. This edition was printed from Haydock's earliest impressions of his Bible in 1811, as Dr. Cotton tells us, *verbum verbo*, in consequence of the wish expressed by Dr. Scott, one of the Scotch Vicars-Apostolic.

4. 1852-56. This splendid edition, which is published by Messrs. Dunigan of New York in quarto, is introduced to the public by those many high approbations and recommendations to which we have already referred. Dr. Cotton says that "it appears to have been copied from Haydock's first impression of 1811." Our own copy of Haydock's New Testament is dated Manchester, 1814, nor do we believe that there is any earlier impression of the New Testament. Now, Dr. Cotton says, "the press-work occupied three years and two months, the last sheet being worked off 11th September 1814, although the title-pages bear earlier date" (p. 86). This being the case, we do not know how to follow him in his belief that the edition of 1852-56 is reprinted from Hay-

dock's first impression. We have not been able to find any information on the subject in the edition itself. Our reason for questioning Dr. Cotton's belief is, that, on taking twenty instances of text at hazard in the editions of 1811-14 and of 1852-56, we found the latter to differ from the former in seven, of which four are altered back to Challoner's editions, one agrees with Cardinal Wiseman's, and two with no edition with which we are acquainted.

5. 1853. This edition in 4to, with Haydock's notes abridged, is due to the Very Rev. Dr. Husenbeth, who undertook it, as he informs us, "with the approbation and sanction of his ecclesiastical superior, the Right Rev. Dr. Wareing, and with the concurrent approbation and sanction of all the Right Rev. Vicars-Apostolic of Great Britain." Approbations from the Vicars-Apostolic of England and Scotland follow.

§ 5. CURRENT EDITIONS.

We may fitly sum up this account of public and authorised editions of the English Bible, with a notice of its existing texts and their relation to the text of the original Rheims and Douay. We conceive these texts may be represented by the editions of Cardinal Wiseman in England, and of Dr. Murray and Dr. Denvir in Ireland, to which may be added Mr. Haydock's in the United States, till the learned Archbishop of Baltimore completes the laborious work to which he has so long devoted himself.

1. *The Old Testament.*

As to the Old Testament, as we have already said, there has been no material alterations in its text since the revision or retranslation executed by Dr. Challoner. (1) Dr. Hay's text exactly follows Dr. Challoner's edition of 1763-4. So says Dr. Cotton, p. 77; and we can corroborate him as far as this, that, on comparing Challoner's 1750 with Hay's, we find that, all through the four volumes of the Old Testament, page answers faithfully to page: *e.g.* there are 507 pages in each first volume, ending with Ruth; 487 in the second, ending with Esther; and so on. So again, p. 300, vol. iii., ends with Eccles. iv. 9, in both; p. 400 in vol. iv. ends with Mal. iii. 9, in both, &c. (2) Again, Dr. Gibson's text "is taken from Bishop Challoner" (*ibid.* p. 110). (3) Of Syers's, the same authority says that "the text appears to agree with that of Dr. Challoner." We have collated it with Dr. Challoner's of 1750, in Eccles. x. and Isai. l., and find, as he would lead us to expect, not a single difference of reading between them.

(4) Lastly, as to Dr. Troy's Bibles of 1791 and 1816. Speaking of the former of these, Dr. Cotton says: "I have observed a few variations [from Dr. Challoner] in several of the books, as in Dan. ii." &c. In these instances the text of 1791 is followed by that of 1816, which "generally follows Dr. Challoner, but occasionally differs, as in Neh. [2 Esdr.] ix. 17, John xxvi. 13, Isai. viii. 19, Ezech. xix. 5." Since, then, Dr. Troy is followed by the editions of Haydock, Dr. Murray, Dr. Denvir, and Cardinal Wiseman, pp. 124, 146, 149, which we have taken to represent the current text or texts of the day, we are safe in saying, first, that Challoner's revision has been hitherto a final one; next that there is at present, as regards the Old Testament, one, and only one, received text, or very nearly so.

In verification of Dr. Cotton's statements, we have compared together the text of five passages in the Old Testament, taken at random in five editions: viz in Dr. Challoner's of 1750, and in the current editions of 1847, Richardsons, London (Cardinal Wiseman's); of 1853, Dolman, London (Dr. Denvir's); of 1854, Duffy, Dublin (Dr. Murray's); and of 1856, Dunigan, New York (Haydock's), with the following results:

1. 4 Kings xx. 1-11. They all agree *verbatim*, except that in v. 8, Haydock, instead of "What shall be the sign that I *shall* go up to the temple," reads, "What is the sign that I *will* go up." This is correctly printed after Haydock's text of 1811. Again, in v. 11, where the other four read "*in* the dial," Haydock, 1856 (after the edition of 1811), reads "*on* the dial."

2. Job xiii. 1-10. Where Challoner has changed the Douay "or shall *it* please him," v. 9, into "shall *this*," the four current editions have gone back to "*it*."

3. Psalm x. For "*the* Psalm of David" of the Douay 1635, Challoner reads "*a* Psalm for David." He is followed by Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Murray, and Dr. Denvir; but Haydock (after ed. 1811) substitutes "*a* Psalm to David."

4. Psalm lxvii. 12-21. For Challoner's "amongst," v. 14, the four current editions read "among." For the "Sina," v. 18, of Douay, Challoner, Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Murray, and Dr. Denvir, Haydock (after ed. 1811) reads "Sinai."

5. Isai. xxviii. 20-29. For "the mountain of divisions," v. 21 of Challoner, Murray, Dr. Denvir, and Haydock, Cardinal Wiseman reads "division." In v. 21 Murray, apparently by an error of press, leaves out "that he may do his work, his strange work." The same edition and Dr. Denvir's read "thrash," where the others read "thresh."

These are all the variations which we have discovered between Dr. Challoner and the four modern editions, in the passages in question. On the other hand, if we would see the concordant divergence of all five from the old Douay of 1635, we may take the following instances out of the same passages:

1. Where the four editions all read, "In the Lord I put my trust, how then do you say to my soul, Get thee away from hence to the mountain like a sparrow?" in the Douay we find, "I trust in the Lord, How say ye to my soul, Pass over unto the mountain as a sparrow."

2. Where the four editions read, "For they have destroyed the things which thou hast made; but what has the just man done?" the Douay has, "For they have destroyed the things which thou didst perfect; but the just, what hath he done?"

3. Where the four editions read, "The Lord shall give the word to them that preach good tidings with great power; the king of powers is of the beloved, of the beloved, and the beauty of the house shall divide spoils;" the Douay runs, "Our Lord shall give the word to them that evangelise with great power; the king of hosts, the beloved of the beloved, and to the beauty of the house to divide the spoils."

4. And, where the four editions read, "And now do not mock, lest your bonds be tied strait, for I have heard of the Lord, the God of hosts, a consumption and a cutting short upon all the earth. Give ear and hear my voice, hearken and hear my speech;" the Douay reads, "And now mock not, lest perhaps your bonds be tied strait; for I have heard of our Lord, the God of hosts, consummation and abridgment upon all the earth. Hearken with your ears, and hear my voice; attend, and hear my speech."

2. *The New Testament.*

Now, lastly, we come to the current editions of the New Testament. Of the four current editions which we have been using, Dr. Cotton has given us, as we have said above, the following account: that Dr. Murray's text rather follows Dr. Challoner's early editions of 1749-50; that Dr. Denvir's agrees with Dr. Murray's; that Cardinal Wiseman's seems to follow Dr. Troy's of 1791 or 1803 and Haydock's; and that Haydock, professing to follow Challoner, does not always do so.

We have thought it sufficient, in corroboration, to take at hazard two passages, 1 Thess. iii. 1-5 and Apoc. xvi. 1-6. On collating together the text of these in the four current

editions of 1847, 1853, 1854, and 1856, we find altogether twelve variations between them; one in the passage of the Thessalonians, eleven in that of the Apocalypse. And we are able to trace them all to one or other of Challoner's editions of 1749, 1750, 1752, and of Troy's of 1791, 1794, except three of 1856 (Haydock's, New York). We shall show this best by throwing the variations into a tabular form.

Var.	Murray, 1854, follows	Denvir, 1853, follows	Wiseman, 1847, follows	Haydock, 1856, follows
1	Challoner.	Troy, 1794.	T. 1794.	T. 1794.
2	C. 1749.	C. 1749.	C. 1752.	C. 1752.
3	C. 1749.	C. 1749.	C. 1752.	C. 1752.
4	C.	C.	T.	T.
5	C.	C.	T.	T.
6	C.	C.	T.	T.
7	C.	C.	T. 1794.	T. 1794.
8	C.	C.	T. 1794.	?
9	C.	C.	T. 1791.	?
10	C. 1749.	C. 1749.	C. 1752.	C. 1752.
11	C.	C.	T.	T.
12	C.	C.	T. 1794.	?

It appears from this analysis, as far as it is a fair specimen of the respective texts, that Dr. Murray and Dr. Denvir follow Challoner's early editions, and that Cardinal Wiseman and Mr. Haydock follow his later editions and Dr. Troy's; and this is pretty much what Dr. Cotton has said. As to the three readings, which are referrible to no former edition, of which we are possessed, these all occur in no other of the four current editions besides the New-York Haydock, and, what is remarkable, they do not occur in the Haydock of 1811-14, which follows in all three passages Dr. Troy's edition of 1794. The probability is, that the New-York editor has fairly used the same liberty of alteration which has been exercised by other editors before him.

We here close our sketch of the history of the received version, from the date of the Rheims and Douay translators to the present day. The versions of the New Testament, or portions of Scripture, which have at various times been given to the world by divines and scholars,—such as Mr. Nary, Dr. Witham, and of late years by Dr. Lingard and the Archbishop of Baltimore,—demand a separate consideration.

THE MISSION OF THE ISLES OF THE NORTH.

[Continued from p. 22.]

It would be an interesting work, to trace out the causes and the course of civilisation in the case of particular nations compared one with another. Some nations have been civilised by conquering, others by being conquered. The moral and social advancement of Spain, Gaul, and South Britain under the Roman yoke is an instance of the latter process; but more commonly the victorious people has been the pupil, not the teacher, and has voluntarily placed itself at the feet of those whom it began by treading under its own. This appears from the nature of the case: the more favoured countries of the earth are the natural seats of civilisation; and these are the very objects of the cupidity of northern or eastern races, who are at once more warlike and less refined. Accordingly, the rude warrior quits his ice-bound crags, his desolate steppes, or his burning sands, for the sunny hills or the well-watered meadows of the temperate zone; and when he has made good his footing in his new abode, what was the incentive of his conquest becomes the instrument of his education. Thus it was that Goths and Lombards put off their national fierceness; thus it was that the fanatic Arab was transmuted into the polished knight of Seville or Granada; and thus the Northman also softened both his name and his nature, and over his characteristic qualities,—the cruelty, the cunning, and romantic ambition of his barbarism,—threw the fantastic garb of Christian chivalry.

The ordinary course of barbarian invasion is such as this: Certain tribes are in the advance of the rest, being the vanguard of a large host or the fugitives of unsuccessful war; they come down upon the country which is to be their prey in successive expeditions; like billows tumbling one over the other, they sweep through it; then, like waves, they retire, and then again, after an interval, they return. Next, they exact contributions, and are again and again bought off. Next, either by violence or by treaty, they gain possession and occupation of some territory, and take their place as landed proprietors amid the old tenants and institutions of the soil. This turns out to be a more politic bribe than gold; it is a gift once for all; it puts them under teaching, and imposes on them responsibilities. In a while we find them happily influenced by the civilisation, be it greater or less, into which they have thrust themselves. They imitate the customs and

manners of their new country; they acquire a moral perception and a standard of judgment to which before they were utter strangers; they give up their old idolatry. They trade and make money; they grow conservative; they learn to be ashamed of the savage habits of their forefathers; they make common cause with the old inhabitants in repelling the fresh invasions of their own kindred. Perhaps they even act a charitable part towards the latter, sending them missionaries, or returning the captives or hostages whom they have taken, to teach them a purer faith and the arts of life.

These successive steps in course of civilisation took a character of their own in the remarkable race whose history has so intimate a bearing on the two islands of the North; and as we have enlarged above upon the terrible and revolting features of the Scandinavian character, so it is to our purpose now to speak of the singular alleviations with which its enormities were, as time went on, accompanied, till it changed into the chivalrous Norman. Though of the same stock as the Saxons, the Northmen were gifted with a more heroic cast of soul. Perhaps it was the peculiar scenery and climate of their native homes which suggested to them such lofty aspirations, and such enthusiastic love of danger and hardship. The stillness of the desert may fill the fierce Arab with a rapturous enjoyment,* and the interminable forests of Britain or Germany might breathe profound mystery; but the icy mountains and the hoarse resounding waves of the North nurtured warriors of a princely stature, both in mind and body, befitting the future occupants of European thrones. Cradled in the surge and storm, they were spared the temptation of indolence and luxury: they neither worshipped the vivifying powers of nature with the Greek, nor with the Sabeans did they kiss the hand to the bright stars of heaven; but, while they gave a personal presence and volition to the fearful or the beautiful spirits which haunted the mountains or lay in ambush in the mist, they understood by daily experience that good could not be had by the mere wishing, and they made it a first article in their creed that their reward was future, and that their present must be toil.

The light and gloom, the nobleness, sternness, and the fancifulness, of the Northman character are admirably portrayed in the romantic tales of Fouqué. At one time he brings before us the honour-loving Froda, the friend of the Skalds, who had been taught in the book of a learned Ice-

* "A young French renegade confessed to Chateaubriand that he never found himself alone galloping in the desert without a sensation approaching to rapture, which was indescribable." Notes to the *Bride of Abydos*.

lander how the Lady Aslauga, a hundred years and more before, had in her golden veil of flowing hair won the love of King Ragnar Lodbrog, and who, smit with devotion to her, saw from time to time the sudden apparition of his bright queen in the cloudy autumn sky, animating him to great and warlike deeds. At another time, it is the Lady Minnetrost, the good Druda, far up upon the shores of the Baltic, on her high moonlit tower, with her long white finger lifted up and pointing to the starry sky. Then, again, we have the tall slim form of the beautiful Sigrid, with her large blue eyes, singing her charm, gathering witch-herbs, and brewing her witch-draught, which makes heroes invincible in fight, and works in the banquet a black mysterious woe. Then we have the gigantic form of men on the islands of the lake, with massive breastplates, and huge brazen bucklers, and halberts so high that they seemed like the masts of vessels. And then the vessel comes in sight, ready for the use of the sea-knights in their pirate expeditions; and off they go over the bounding waves, on their terrible errands of blood and fire, to gain immortal glory by inflicting untold pain. And suddenly appears one of them at a marriage-feast in Normandy, the sea-king Arinbiorn; one of those warriors in the high-coast country who own little or nothing on the mainland, but who sail round the earth in their light barks in the company of brave and devoted followers, passing from one side of the North Cape, nay, even from distant Iceland, down to bright Constantinople, or along the coasts of blooming Asia or of burning Africa, where almost all other seamen are at fault. And at another time we are shown the spectres of remorse and death and judgment, and the living forms of pride, passion, and temptation, in the history of the troubled child of the fierce warrior of Drontheim; and, on the other hand, the pattern knight and his lady bright coming back to their old country from the plains of Frank-land, and presenting to the savage northern race the very ideal which they vaguely sought after, but could not adumbrate; and the pale dark-haired Sintram, calmed and vanquished by the voice and lute of the fair Gabrielle.

This of course is romance; but if it may be taken as an anticipation of what the Northmen became in the Normans, their descendants, it suggests to us that there certainly existed between the latter people and the Church of the middle age a ground of sympathy and mutual respect which was not common, at least to the same extent, to her great Pontiffs and to either Anglo-Saxons or Scots. The ministers of peace and the messengers of war, as contrary as life and death, nevertheless

had a bond of attachment and union in the thorough-going simplicity of purpose with which they fearlessly worked out their respective objects. The Norman knight recognised no earthly standard, no earthly recompense; his end might be fanciful and eccentric, but it was ideal; it might be honour, glory, the noble, the sublime, but at least it was unselfish; and so far it resembled Christianity. The first transaction between this strange people and the Pope was a significant introduction to the relations in which they stood towards each other in the times which followed. St. Leo IX. had led out an army against them; they fought him, gained the battle, took him prisoner, and then, prostrating themselves at his feet, asked his forgiveness and his blessing.* He consented, and made them his allies. Not many years after, they were the protection of the great Hildebrand against the Emperor. That magnanimous Pope, and his contemporary, William the Conqueror, may be taken as types respectively of their opposite missions; and they were apparently shy of each other. It is the greatest compliment that the secular historian can pay to William, if Hildebrand kept at a distance from him; it is the greatest compliment that the historian can pay to Hildebrand, to say that William wished to gain his approbation.

So different, however, at first sight, is this Norman of the eleventh century from the savage pirate who ravaged England and Ireland in the ninth and tenth, that it is of importance in the history of civilisation to be able to trace some points of connection between their respective national characteristics. This we can succeed in doing to a certain extent; and we think there is no extravagance in professing actually to detect the germs of the knight of chivalry, and to note down the dates of their taking form and gradually developing, in the chronicles of the wild Scandinavian. For instance, as we have already suggested, the distinctive trait of the barbarian of the North, as contrasted with other barbarians, was his perception and pursuit of the *pulchrum*, his belief in some excellence more than ordinary, his worship of some recondite incommunicable perfection, which excited in him an enthusiastic passion, and required for its attainment a superhuman effort. This great quality of mind showed itself in the rude Northman as well as in the Norman, and, as regards lesser matters, became that affectation of the rare and uncommon which we afterwards find in history as a familiar attribute of the latter people. As an instance, we may specify the value he set on proficiency in bodily exercises. Feats of strength, indeed,

* Bowden's Hildebrand, vol. i. p. 165.

are held in esteem by all nations, barbarous or not; but the Scandinavian aimed not at mere muscular energy, but at a proficiency which has something of an intellectual character,—at strength united to dexterity, versatile in its exhibition and ready for the emergence. Olaf, son of Triggva, was a genuine sea-king in the lawlessness of his deeds and the romance of his fortunes. Born fatherless, on a small island, whither his mother had fled for her life, captured and sold into Russia, escaping and turning pirate, sweeping round the coasts of Scotland, Ireland, Wales, France, Flanders, and Friesland, converted to Christianity in the Scilly islands, marrying, or rather married by a princess of Dublin, and at length made king of Norway,—he seems to have his character sufficiently described in this mere outline of his history, and to promise nothing more at best than the resolve, daring, and fortitude of a piratical adventurer. But he had accomplishments too.* That he should have been able to climb precipices and run down them again heavily laden with spoil,—this, indeed, was a talent suitable and needful to the plunderer; but we should hardly have expected in so rude a personage that he was practised in certain gymnastic arts, that he could run along upon the oars while the rowers were pulling, that he could throw at once two darts to their respective marks, and that he could play at flinging up swords and catching them alternately, after the manner of an Indian juggler. Perfect command of the limbs, skill, neatness and grace in their exercise, were as much in honour with the Northman as with the knights of a tournament. He could govern his vessel as readily as a horse; he could wrestle, swim, skate, row, and, though a sea-king, he could ride.

Character, we have said, is shown in little things: it is for this reason that in this connection we remark, by the way, that the precision and exquisiteness of the Scandinavian appeared also in his choice of food and apparel. The Anglo-Saxons wore beards; the Normans shaved; now in doing so they followed the custom of the old country which they had left. Thus Harold, who waged war against the pirates, let his hair grow, as a sort of penance, till he had been successful in it; when he became king of Norway, he submitted to his father's cutting it. The ancestors of the fastidious Normans trimmed and combed their hair even up in Scandinavia; they bathed frequently, dressed handsomely, and ornamented their war-vessels. They were nice in their eating; and, as we observed in a former page, disdaining wine as a mere incentive to conviviality, were temperate in the use of it.

* Turner, *Middle Ages*, vol. i. p. 65; Thierry, *Normans*, book ii.

These, however, are lesser matters ; the most obvious and prominent point of character, common to the Northman and Norman, is the peculiarity of their warlike heroism. War was their life ; it was almost their *summum bonum* ; good in itself, though nothing came of it. The impetuosity of the Norman relieved itself in extravagances, and raises a smile from its very intensity ; at one time becoming a religious fanaticism, at another a fantastic knight-errantry. His very worship was to do battle ; his rite of sacrifice was a passage of arms. He couched his lance to prove the matter of fact that his lady was the beautifullest of all conceivable women ; he drew his sword on the blasphemer to convince him of the sanctity of the Gospel ; and he passed abruptly from demolishing churches and burning towns to the rescue of the Holy Sepulchre from the unclean infidel. In the Northmen, too, this pride of demolition had been their life-revel. They destroyed for destroying-sake, because it was good to destroy ; it was a display of power, and power made them gods. They seemed as though they were possessed by some inward torment, which needed outlet, and which degraded them to the madness of their own Berserkirs for the want of some nobler satisfaction. Their fearful activity was their mode of searching out something great, they knew not what, the idea of which haunted them. It impelled them to those sudden descents and rapid careerings about a country, of which we have already spoken ; and which, even in modern times, has broken out in the characteristic energy of Gustavus and Charles XII. of Sweden. Hence, too, when they had advanced some steps in the path of civilisation, from this nature or habit of restlessness they could not bear neutrality ; they interfered actively in the cause of right, in proportion as they gave up the practice of wrong. When they began to find out that piracy was criminal, instead of having recourse to peaceful occupations, they found an occupation cognate to piracy itself in putting piracy down. Kings, indeed, would naturally undertake such a mission ; for piracy interfered with their sovereign power, and would not die of itself ; it was not wonderful that Harold, Haco the Good, and St. Olaf should hang the pirates and destroy their vessels ; but the point of our remark is this, that they pursued the transgressors with the same furious zeal with which they had heretofore committed the same transgression themselves. It is sometimes said that a reformed profligate is the sternest of moralists ; and these northern rovers, on their conversion, did penance for their own piracy by a relentless persecution of pirates. They became knight-errants on water, devoted to hardship and peril in the protection of the peaceful

merchant. Under Canute of Denmark a confraternity was formed with this object.* Its members characteristically began by seizing on vessels not their own for its prosecution, and imposing compulsory loans on the wealthy trader for their outfit, though they professed to indemnify their owners out of the booty ultimately secured. Before they went on board, they communicated; they lived soberly and severely, restricting themselves to as few followers as was possible. When they found Christians in the captured ships, they set them at liberty, clothed them, and sent them home. In this way as many as eight hundred pirate vessels were destroyed.

Sometimes, in spite of their reformation, they still pursued a pirate's trade; but it was a modified piracy. They put themselves under laws in the exercise of it, and waged war against those who did not observe them. These objects of their hostility were what Turner calls "indiscriminate" pirates. "Their peculiar and self-chosen task," he says, "was to protect the defenceless navigator, and to seek and assail the *indiscriminate* plunderer. The pirate gradually became hunted down as the general enemy of the human race." He goes on to mention some of the laws imposed by Hjalmar upon himself and other "discriminating" pirates, to the effect that they would protect trade and agriculture, that they would not force women into their ships against their will, and that they would not eat raw flesh.

Now, in what we have been drawing out, there is enough to show both the elementary resemblance of character, and yet the vast actual dissimilitude, between the Scandinavian and the Norman. There is likeness enough to show that the dissimilitude is a *change*: when there is no resemblance at all between a former state and a latter, we do not consider it a change, but that one thing has been substituted for another. Here, however, is a change, and a vast change; and then the question follows, how was it brought about? There is enough in the picture to show that the knight of chivalry may have been made out of the barbarian sea-king; but not enough to suggest, on the other hand, how the barbarian sea-king came ever to be made into the knight of chivalry. It was of course, to answer in general terms, the triumph of Christianity. Hrolfr, or Rollo, left the North a lawless marauder, being driven out by the reforming energy of King Harold of the fair hair; and when he came to France, it was in order to inflict upon it the wars which his kinsmen had inflicted upon England and Ireland. Nor was he remiss in his dreadful mission: but, after ravaging England in company with his

* Lappenberg's England.

countrymen, he landed on the French province which has since been called Normandy, plundered Cambray, menaced Rouen, besieged Paris, took Bayeux, ravaged the neighbourhood of Sens, and levelled St. Lo to the ground. These are specimens of the successful outrages which Rollo committed on an unoffending country; but somehow they ended in his being baptised, receiving a large grant of territory, and at length taking his place among the landholders and nobility of France. He was not the first of his savage countrymen who in that same France had submitted to the Church, and been naturalised, on condition of defending the soil against fresh invasions from the north. And the policy and the compact were perfectly successful. In the course of one hundred and fifty years the race made such advances in the arts of life, as to stand foremost in the civilisation of the day, to be specimens of a particular kind of refinement, and to be in a condition to present religion and to teach manners even to Christian populations of historical name and ancient faith.

And now we come to the question, for the sake of which we have introduced this lengthened notice of the Northmen and their French colony. Why was it that a like process, with a like issue, did not take place in England and Ireland, when barbarians settled among them? Why did not the Danes in both islands succumb to influences which were so potent and so successful on the opposite continent? One and the same fierce foe comes from the North, and extends his devastations on both sides of the British and St. George's Channels; he is so identically one as to have the same leaders, who sometimes carry on their raids in one country, sometimes in another. Ragnar not only ravaged England and Ireland, but he penetrated with his bands to the walls of Paris. Hastings, the formidable opponent of Alfred, plundered on the Seine. Rollo, as we have said, made a descent on England before he came to France. It needs explanation, then, how it came to pass that the same race, being settled, during a contemporaneous period, in two countries, made such very unequal advances in civilisation in the one and in the other.

We conceive the facts to be as we have stated them; the period of settlement is certainly contemporaneous, and the advance in civilisation is as certainly unequal. The country above the Humber was in the possession of Danish princes from A.D. 870 down to the Norman Conquest; East Anglia was colonised by Danes from A.D. 878. The Danes founded or rebuilt Dublin, Wexford, Waterford, Cork, and Limerick, about the year 850; and held them still in 1171, at the date

of what we should call the "Norman Conquest" of Ireland.* Rollo, on the other hand, gained Normandy about 912. If, then, long and intimate intercourse is a necessary condition of influencing, improving, and changing a barbarous race, both Anglo-Saxons and Irish had the opportunity of such intercourse with the Danes more fully than the Franks with the Normans. And yet the Danes did not gain any such benefits from their settlement in England and Ireland, as the Normans reaped from their French inheritance. This is the second point to which we ask the reader's attention.

It may be replied, that English and Irish converted them to Christianity, and that to a higher blessing and greater change they could not have been instrumental. It is true: this conversion was the work of holy men and zealous priests; and that there were such is certain, and that their efforts were prospered is certain, and might have been expected from their zeal and their holiness. But we speak here not of mere submission to the Church and faith in its word, which is commonly all that a preacher would effect in ignorant barbarians; but of that change and elevation of character, that hold and application of religious principles, that self-command, that social progress, which accrue to an uneducated tribe from its intercourse with a more civilised people. Defective as was the civilisation of the Normans, it was substantial. They could live in peace with their neighbours; when they warred, it was according to rule: they revered law; they could govern and be governed: they could adopt a course of policy; and they had refined manners. "A steady justice in his own conduct," says Turner, speaking of Rollo, "an inflexible rigour towards all offenders, and the beneficial results which every one experienced from these provisions, gradually produced a love of equity and subordination to law among his own people. Under his administration Normandy is declared to have had neither thieves, plunderers, nor private seditions." And after quoting a passage from Glaber Rodolphus, which bears witness to the Norman people living "like one great family of relations," to their care of the poor and distressed and strangers, and their religious liberality, he goes on to speak of their love of glory, their incipient love of literature, their general decorum, and lasting steadiness of moral character. That this was the effect of contact with French civilisation, and not from any accidental and unknown force in the Norman colony itself, seems undeniable, not only from that identity, on which we have already dwelt, of the Normans of Frank-land with the Danes of England, and from

* Lyttleton, Henry II. vol. v. p. 35; Lanigan, vol. iii. p. 326, &c.

the fact that fresh and fresh Northmen were continually joining and disturbing, if that had been possible, the Norman body politic, but, on the other hand, from what history tells us of the rapid and complete assimilation of the Norman people with the French, even to the adoption of the French language, and of their utter alienation from their mother country. "The Northmen who settled in Neustria," says Lappenberg, "gradually became lost among the French. French and foreigners have visited Normandy in search of some traces of the old Scandinavian colonies; but vainly have they sought for the original Northmen in the original inhabitants; with the exception of some faint resemblances, they have met with nothing Norsk." "All remembrance of their national poetry," he says presently, "was as completely obliterated from the posterity of the Northmen as if, in traversing the ocean, they had drunk of the water of Lethe."* By the end of the tenth century, "the difference of language," says Thierry, "which had at first marked the line of separation betwixt the nobles and the people of Normandy had almost ceased to exist; and it was by his genealogy that the Norman of Scandinavian descent was distinguished from the Gallo-Franks."† And, "when the use of the *lingua romana* became general throughout Normandy, the Scandinavians ceased to look upon the Normans as their natural allies by kindred; they even ceased to call them by the name of Normans, but called them French, Romans, and Velskes or Welches, their names for the entire population of Gaul." Lappenberg says the same: "If the inhabitants of Normandy cared little about their northern native country, the inhabitants of the north, on their part, almost forgot their fugitive kinsmen, who had gained for themselves another home."

Such is the surprising and speedy change which took place in the Northmen when domiciled in France; not that the Norman character became French, but it ceased to be barbarian, and became Christian; it was a great change. Now let us contrast with it the state of the Danes, or Northmen, or Ostmen, as they are variously called, in England and Ireland. The author last quoted is a most unexceptional witness, because his leaning is against the Normans and the Holy See; as if the Anglo-Saxons would have recovered their former state, and have managed their own matters better, if they had been left alone. Now he says, speaking of the "colonies of the Vikings," "on the coast of Ireland they possessed Dublin, Waterford, Limerick, and Cork. At Dublin resided the principal king of the Northmen; Waterford had also its kings.

* England, pp. 66, 84, transl.

† Norman Conquest, p. 39, transl.

These colonies, which sometimes made war on each other, and at others combined together against the Irish or the English, preserved their warlike spirit, by which, although possessing only a few ports and a small portion of the interior, they were able to maintain themselves for some centuries. Christianity encompassed them on every side; and in the eleventh century they adopted it themselves.* Here, then, is a Scandinavian colony far smaller, or at least more dispersed, than that in Normandy, actually surrounded by Christian populations, and populations of a far earlier Christianity than the Franks, and acted on by them so far as to embrace their religion, yet so little subdued by Christian influences, that there is nothing more to be recorded of them than that they warred on each other and on their Irish neighbours. And it is observable, that, considering there was one king over all their Irish settlements, at least till the beginning of the eleventh century, these wars of the Danes among themselves must have been of the nature of civil wars. Lanigan speaks to the same effect. After saying that the Danes of Dublin were the first of their nation in Ireland who became Christians, he adds, "which, however, did not prevent them from afterwards practising ravages in the same manner that their predecessors had done."† Let it be observed, he does not speak merely of their going to war, which, alas, the most civilised and Christian nations can do, but of continuing the savage raids of their forefathers.

It must be added, that whereas the Normans were converted as early as the date of their coming, the Danes, even of Dublin, were not converted till at the end of a hundred years from their settling there, and those of other Irish cities much later. In the beginning of the eleventh century, near two centuries after their arrival, though "a certain progress," the same writer says, "was made by the Danes in piety and religious practices, yet we find them now and then, even during this period, committing depredations in religious places."‡ How great a contrast to the notorious devotion of the Normans! In spite of all the shortcomings of the latter people, their cruelty and their dissoluteness, they were exemplary in their maintainance of religious worship. "They caused," says Lappenberg,§ "an incredible number of churches and chapels to be built." They became so greatly changed in this particular, that is, from their pagan practices, which led them to destroy churches, and in which the Christian Danes of Ireland still indulged, "that there were none in France who so zealously built churches and cloisters as they. They even established conveyance-fraternities for the erection of

* p. 64.

† Vol. iii. p. 376.

‡ Ibid. p. 433.

§ p. 69.

churches. People took the Sacrament, reconciled themselves with their enemies, and united for this object, choosing a chief or king, under whose direction they drew carts loaded with all kinds of building materials. Probably there were also fraternities of masons." In Ireland, on the contrary, so far from the old Christian inhabitants leading their Danish neophytes to build churches, the Danes taught the Irish to plunder and destroy them, as appears from a passage of Lani-gan, which we quoted in our former part of this discussion. Nay, it is remarkable that the Scandinavian countries themselves received Christianity at as early a date as the bulk of their emigrants, who for two centuries had been in a Christian country; and, again, the Norwegian and Danish Christians on their own soil were much more changed by their conversion than their kinsmen on Irish. "These people," says a contemporary, speaking of the Norwegians, "have learnt to love peace and gentler manners." And another says of the Danes, "They have made progress in the liberal arts; the nobles send their sons to Paris for education, not only for ecclesiastical offices, but also for secular employments."* It is abundantly confirmed by results such as these, which history accidentally records, that Paris had a gift of civilisation at that time which the Irish schools had not.

Let it be observed, too, that the Irish Church had accidentally a collateral assistance in her work, which seemed to make the civilisation of these settlers comparatively an easy task. In consequence of their position, by race Northmen, by birth Irish, by dwelling maritime, they were the natural medium of intercourse between their own and their adopted country, and, in consequence, they took to mercantile occupations. Now, the pursuit of wealth is at least antagonist to barbaric turbulence, even if not directly congenial to Christianity; but in this instance it did not even thus negatively assist the communication of Christian manners from the old Christians to the new. Lyttleton has this apposite remark: "About this time (1095) a civil war divided the Ostmen (Danes of Ireland). From henceforward this people, addicting themselves wholly to commerce, lost much of their valour and military spirit, without making any great improvements in politeness or the civil arts of life."†

It does not seem, indeed, as if there were any tendency in the Danes of Ireland, we will not say to amalgamation, but to intimacy with the people among whom they were settled. On the contrary, they drew off from them, and when the Nor-

* Adam of Bremen and Arnold of Lubeck, in Lappenberg, pp. 61, 62. Vide also Neander, Hist. vol. v. p. 403, Bohn.

† Vol. v. p. 42.

mans had got possession of England, they fell back upon the Normans. Here they are in remarkable contrast to the Normans themselves, who loved their new country so well as to forget "their people and their father's house." So far from such a feeling, the Ostmen would not even allow the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of those who converted them. Sitric, Danish king of Dublin, endowed a see there for his countrymen, A.D. 1040, the first bishop being an Irishman,* because, says Lanigan, "the Danes had as yet scarcely any clergymen of their nation in Ireland." No sooner, however, had the Normans come to England, than they put themselves under the metropolitan see of Canterbury; the reason being, as the same author states, not only the great reputation of Lanfranc the Archbishop (though it is not easy to see what the Danes would care about a great logician and controversialist), but "because William and his Normans, being masters of England from the year 1066, were considered by the Irish Danes as their countrymen." Nor was this the act of the Danes of Dublin only; the Danish Bishops of Waterford and Limerick were consecrated from Canterbury also.†

Once more: till the Normans came to Ireland, the Danes (or Ostmen, as they were called) were distinct communities from the Irish: when the Normans had come, the Normans too remained distinct from the Irish; but the Danes simply disappear from the page of history. "English," says Lapenberg, explaining that by English he means Anglo-Normans, "English, Irish, and Northmen formed three distinct races," in the beginning of the thirteenth century, that is, upon the Norman conquest of Ireland; "but at a later period mention occurs of two nations only, Irish and English; the Ostmen, or Northmen, having disappeared."‡ What is clearer than that the Northmen, who had resisted all assimilation with the Irish for above three centuries, had at once felt the attraction of their kindred, and had been absorbed by the conquerors,—absorbed as promptly and spontaneously, as the Normans, on their part, had been united, not to any of their own compatriots, but to the Franks around them?

If, then, the Ostmen, or Danes, of Ireland needed civilising, and the Irish could not civilise them, and the Normans could, then, for the sake both of the Danes who needed a great benefit, and of the Irish who could not supply it, it was surely not unreasonable in the Pope, nor unsuitable to his high mission, to sanction the expedition of the Normans to Ireland with the object of converting the one and reforming the other. We do not deny that there was something of a

* Lanigan, vol. iii. p. 433, &c.

† Ibid. p. 464.

‡ p. 64.

grave rebuke in sending to that old Catholic population specimens of barbarians whom others had civilised, in order to the civilisation of kinsmen of those barbarians, whom, though living among them, they have been unable to civilise themselves. At the same time, this measure was no disparagement of the Irish schools, or of the learning and sanctity of their members; for, as we have already had occasion to observe, it is not of the nature of colleges or cloisters to radiate knowledge and manners through the many.

Now to pass on to the case of England. What the schools were to Ireland, such was the monarchy to our own country; each institution was the seat of national life and the hope of national reformation. There were certainly weak and unworthy Anglo-Saxon monarchs; and there was both rash speculation and ecclesiastical disorder in the Irish schools, as is clear from the instance of Erigena and others on the one hand, and from the strange and lasting scandals of Armagh on the other.* Still the schools were the salt of Ireland, and acted on the population, Christian and pagan, indirectly by means of the holy preachers who went out from them; and in like manner there were among the English kings so many able, successful, and, we will add, religious rulers, that they may fairly be taken to represent the monarchy. Such are Egbert, Alfred, Edward, Athelstan, Edgar, and Edmund. They were the instruments of the conversion of vast numbers of the Northmen to the Christian faith. It was Alfred who adopted the policy, which had succeeded so well across the Channel, of settling the Danes in the east of England, on condition of their baptism. Athelstan, in like manner, when he subjected the Northumbrian Danes to his sway, made them Christians. The same prince was intrusted with the education of Haco the Good of Norway, who, though he did not succeed in bringing his subjects to the faith he had himself embraced, contributed much towards their national civilisation. St. Olaf, king of the same country, who sent for Bishops and priests from England, did but avail himself of what Haco had begun. Yet, though a royal court could exert more influence both at home and abroad than a number of scattered convents and colleges, it could neither do a people's work, nor educate a people into doing it. What was wanted in England was a mass of Christianity, so living as to leaven and transform the pagan neophytes. The monarchy might effect the conversion of the Danish settlers, but it could not effect their civilisation. If the Anglo-Saxon population was in a state of disorder,

* *E. g.* Dubdabeth III. had even been a professor in the Armagh school. Lanigan, vol. iii. pp. 428, 449.

despondency, and misery, it would only be further degraded by the contact of barbarians, instead of having any power to raise them even to its own unsatisfactory level. And this, we know, was the case. The savage invaders had demoralised the English: can there be a more pregnant fact than that of which we have already spoken, that from the reign of Ethelred (A.D. 1013) to that of Henry II. (A.D. 1171), for at least one hundred and fifty years, the Anglo-Saxons sold their relatives, and even their children, into foreign slavery, as if they had been a tribe of unreclaimed Africans?*

Moreover, though England had an advantage over Ireland in the unity of its governing power, on the other hand it had this counterbalancing disadvantage, that the foreign settlers were far more numerous, and the territory they covered far more extensive. If Ireland was broken up into small principalities, its Danish inmates, too, were divided from each other, and surrounded by the Christian population. But as to England, at one memorable date the whole of it was in the power of the Danes except Somersetshire and the far west. At Alfred's death all the country was theirs to the north of the Humber and the east of the Thames and Ouse. Later, a line drawn from Chester to the mouth of the Thames through Bedfordshire, serves to describe their frontier. Even when they were subjects of the Anglo-Saxon monarchs, they had their own laws. At length a Dane became monarch of the whole country; and did more for its welfare than the Anglo-Saxon kings who preceded him. The choice seemed to lie between Dane or Norman, if the nation was to be raised from its abject condition; and the Norman, not more cruel than the Dane, was far more advanced in civilisation.

It must be recollected too, that, whatever might be the advantage of a monarchy, one bad king could undo the work of three or four vigorous ones: and bad or worthless there were. One act reversed all the efforts of the great princes whom we mentioned above. The Anglo-Saxons could not hope to convert the Danes after the crime of St. Brice's day 1002, which is the St. Bartholomew's eve of our history. On the eve of that festival, "every city," says Turner, "received secret letters from the king, commanding the people, at an appointed hour, to destroy the Danes there suddenly by the sword, or to surround and consume them with fire."† Though at that time they were living in peace with the English, the royal mandate was obeyed. All through England, Christians as they were for the most part, the Danes, their wives, their

* Turner, *Anglo-Saxons*, vol. ii. p. 322; Lingard, *Hist.* vol. i. p. 244; Lyttleton, vol. v. p. 91.

† Vol. ii. p. 312.

families, their infants, were mercilessly butchered. "The horror of the murder," says Lingard, "was in many places aggravated by every insult and barbarity which national hatred could suggest. At London they fled for security to the churches, and were massacred in crowds round the altars."* The number of victims and extent of the massacre are unknown. It could hardly, indeed, include the old settlers, now half English, in the north and east. Some authors have maintained that the savage command was only directed against the Danish soldiers in English pay; Thierry, apparently disbelieving that it was the act of the Anglo-Saxon king, would make us believe that the only victims were the Danes, who had just before made a truce with Ethelred, and who, after receiving, according to the bargain, their price for leaving the kingdom, had broken their engagement by a renewal of their excesses. But in that case women and children would not have suffered. Gunhilda, the sister of the Danish Sweyn, the father of Canute, had embraced Christianity, and had married Palig, a naturalised Dane. Her children and husband were slaughtered before her eyes; then she was put to death herself. She predicted the vengeance that would follow.

Her prediction was in no long time fulfilled. The shrieks of the victims of that day were the knell of the Anglo-Saxon power. The savage Sweyn wreaked his vengeance in fresh devastations and slaughters, which terminated in the subjugation of England and the successful usurpation of Canute. St. Edward who followed was the morning star of a heavy day, saintly and beautiful himself, but the forerunner of the foreigners in his acts, and the harbinger of woe in his last words.

Our immediate question, however, here, as in the case of Ireland, is, how were the Danes to be converted? Anticipating the future by the best lights of prudence and experience, we should have said at that time, that with these Danes lay the prospects of good or evil for that England of which they had so long been the scourge and the ruin. They were a young, energetic, enterprising, ambitious people. They could fight, they could trade; but they had to learn the lessons of the gospel and the arts of life. Could England be their teacher, after the massacre of St. Brice? If a Christian nation slaughtered its unsuspecting converts, who would be converted by it henceforth? The poor Anglo-Saxons had only strength for a treacherous and impotent revenge.

* History, vol. i. p. 240.

[To be continued.]

Communicated Articles.

THOUGHTS ON THE CAUSES OF THE PRESENT WAR.

It is M. Guizot, I think, who has somewhere remarked, that the peculiar function of France in European politics seems to be that of investing with a tangible and recognised existence the new ideas which, one after another, are destined to exert a paramount influence over the development of society. Other countries, he would grant, may claim the parentage of the thinker; but the thought must pass through the crucible of French assimilation before it can go out into the world to conquer and rule mankind. France holds the apostolate of successful innovation. The rivalry of her statesmen, the contest of her parties, the changes of her public opinion, are a microcosm in which fiercer struggles and more widespread revolutions are foreshadowed for our guidance or warning. So that, virtually, the drama of the future is for ever being acted out before our eyes; and if we desire to anticipate the history of Europe, we have little else to do than to investigate the condition of France.

The theory, no doubt, has an air of suspicious completeness; and it may easily be exaggerated into palpable falsehood. But if it does not precisely express a truth, it may at least serve to indicate one; and considering how pre-eminently the phases of society and government in France have, in point of fact, engaged the anxiety of thoughtful politicians for the last twelve, and even for the last seventy years, we shall scarcely be far wrong if we turn to that country for a solution of the difficulties that first meet us when we attempt to trace the leading causes of the war in which she is now engaged.

Ostensibly, of course, the great French Revolution was made in the joint name of liberty and equality; but, among those who made it, the appreciation of liberty existed only in the minds of the few, while the love of equality filled the hearts of the many. It was long before, under Louis XIV., that the two principles had really tested their respective strength. Liberty had stood forward as the antagonist of absolute power, and had fallen in the struggle; but equality had found itself adopted by that power, as the instrument and guarantee of its own victory. From that time forward, under the levelling process of administrative centralisation, the spirit of freedom gradually became extinct; and the old social hierarchy, which it had animated and sustained, passed down through all the stages of decrepitude into the con-

dition of an impotent and irritating pageant. Thus, when the formal crisis came, the real work was done. Towards one supreme principle all desires gathered, all tendencies converged; and before a blow had well been struck, equality stood master of the field, not only without an enemy to impede its advance, but without even an ally to control its action. The natural consequence followed. What till then had been a taste, an instinct, or a habit, grew into a passion—a passion burning, insatiable, unconquerable, undying—a passion which from that hour has swayed the whole people of France with a strength so vigorous and unrelaxing as to have made it the first law of her political existence, and the key to all her subsequent history. She has become a prey since then to distress, humiliation, slavery, barbarism itself; but never for one instant, even in thought, has she submitted to the domination of an aristocracy. And though, at present, if she had her choice, she might prefer a free to a despotic government, she would yet fling freedom to the winds without a moment's hesitation, rather than sacrifice one jot of that social equality on which her heart is fixed at once with all the pride of conquest and with all the love of inheritance.

A passion for social equality resolves itself, in its ultimate analysis, into a passion for individual distinction. What people who are under its influence desire, is simply that all men should start in life under the same set of external conditions; so that every break in the dead level of society should mark what some successful aspirant has achieved for himself by his own unassisted power. Their ideal of the world is a fair field where there should be no favour, where every man should stand on the ground of his own proper merit, and the race should be to the swift alone, and the battle only to the strong. And the reason why this ideal captivates them is not its mere intellectual symmetry, or the perfection with which it seems to them to exemplify the principle of pure justice. The real fascination lies in its appeal to their personal ambition. When society is formed on an aristocratic model, no man can live simply to himself. His aims are widened, if not exalted, by the complexity of his relations with his fellows. His actions are the property of the class to which he belongs; and if they are glorious, their glory radiates in a circle of which he is the centre only—not the circumference. But in a democracy every man's life is his own. He is but one among a crowd of isolated atoms, "*sine rectore, sine affectibus mutuis, quasi ex alio genere mortalium repente in unum collecti, numerus magis quam colonia.*"* The motives of great deeds have passed away with the conditions that pro-

* Tacitus, *Annal.* xiv. 27.

duced them; and their place is filled by a multitude of those small ambitions which lie within the scope of each man's daily business, and depend for their attainment mainly on the possession of material wealth. That wealth, in consequence, becomes progressively the measure of individual position, and individual position becomes progressively the object of desire; till every alien thought and sentiment is gradually brought into subjection, and all the elements both of personal and national character are blended into harmony with the master passion of money-getting.

The god of war may now and then find devotees among the gamblers of the Stock Exchange, but his worship is essentially incompatible with an intelligent and settled love of riches. All other things that nations covet—power, glory, vengeance, freedom—may be won on the battlefield; but victory and defeat are alike in this, that they consume beyond redemption men and money,—the ultimate expression of material wealth, and the instrument of its continued reproduction. I do not say there may not be moments, in any state of society, when some burst of generous enthusiasm, or some outbreak of fanatical vanity, may turn away men's thoughts from the pursuit of their commercial interests. I do not say there may not be stages of national development when the passion for amassing wealth is spread more widely than the knowledge of those scientific laws which govern and determine its accumulation. I do not say that, even when that knowledge is complete, men will not sometimes take the narrowest view of their own interest, clutching at the immediate gain of some investment which can only be employed for their ultimate ruin. But these exceptional phenomena rather illustrate than contradict the broad general law. They take their place, indeed, when duly analysed, among the very proofs of its existence; and by defining the precise point to which its operation has attained, they supply us with a criterion for measuring the advance of any age or nation along the path of democratic progress.

That path is one which France has trodden for the last two centuries with a firm, undeviating, unrelenting step. Modest and humble at the outset, winning its way with the stealth of a Socratic argument, the spirit of equality never changed its course, never faltered in the terrible directness of its aim, never turned aside in fear or pity, till the crash of the old society which it had undermined rang out its triumph to the ears of Europe. The revel that ensued was but a necessary phase of its development, and came to a natural and appointed end; and from that time France began to enter on the final stage of democratic progress,—the stage in

which, if any where at all, some compensation will be gained for the noble aims and manly virtues that have perished with the influence of an aristocracy. There are men who look with something like contempt on the restless monotony of that commercial spirit which has been gaining ground in France since the epoch of the Restoration. I cannot agree with them. A nation which is thoroughly democratised must be a nation either of traders or of brigands; and when France, at the Restoration, chose between that alternative, she chose the better part. She was faithful to the idea of her own history, and her real mission in the world. Emerging from her saturnalia of blood and crime, she laid aside its polluted and degrading traditions; and, taking up the threads of her true national life at the point where she had dropped them some thirty years before, she set herself to regain the leadership of that modern civilisation which is founded on the maintenance of a pacific policy, and aims at the steady promotion of social amelioration and refinement.

But her new society contained within itself the elements of one inevitable antagonism. Face to face with a democratic people stood that great legacy of the Empire, a democratic army; and while the one was ever tending to a normal state of peace, the other was ever craving for a state of actual war. That insatiable thirst for fighting which distinguishes the French army, is not the mere reflection of its historical traditions; still less is it a consequence of the political accidents of the moment. Unhappily for Europe and for civilisation, the cause of it lies deep in the constitution of human nature. "Every French soldier," Napoleon used to say, "carries a marshal's baton in his knapsack;" and the words expressed a pregnant and a fearful truth. For systematic promotion from the ranks is precisely the application of democratic principles to the organisation of an army; and that same passion for distinction which leads the citizen to a career of peaceful industry or enterprise, impels the soldier, by a double force, in the precisely opposite direction. Where such an antagonism exists, there can be no mutual sympathy between the nation and the army; and in France it is notorious that there is none. Society has but cold welcome for the soldier; and the soldier accordingly has little love for society. The army is his world, the home of his interests, the area of his desires; and within its narrow limit he acts out an exaggerated counterpart of the struggles of ambition that are going on beyond. The subaltern looks down on his old companions in the ranks, doubly tenacious of an elevation which excites their envy without securing their respect. The captain puts a barrier between himself and his subaltern, never

associates with him in his hours of recreation, and seldom even shares his mess. The field-officer stands aloof from both—stiffly condescending to the one, anxiously unconscious of the other. To gain a step is simply to be transferred from a lower to a higher state of society; for there is no counter-vailing influence to break through the stiff lines of military rank; and from the first marshal to the last recruit, the uniform is the one test of social position and the one measure of individual worth. In an army so constituted, what can possibly be the prevailing sentiment but eagerness for promotion, and for war as the means of promotion? Every man's superior has become his natural enemy,—not merely an obstacle in the way of his obtaining this or that particular place or commission, but a bar drawn straight from side to side across the whole pathway of his life, stopping his advance at every point. That bar cannot be evaded or overcome; it must be altogether removed. Its removal is what constitutes a success in life. So that, given an equality of average intelligence, the most successful soldier is precisely the soldier whose officers are killed the quickest.

This antagonism between the army and the people has indicated, since the Restoration, the great problem of the government of France. In scope it has been an antagonism of interest as well as feeling, and it has existed under conditions which render an enduring compromise impossible. Either the army must triumph over the people, in the establishment of a military despotism; or the people must not merely assert its independence, but effectually vindicate its supremacy over the army.

Now the only way in which civil society can ever hold its own against the armed force that coexists with it, is by exercising a real and vigorous control over the expenditure without which that force can neither be raised nor maintained. And if this is true even in the case of aristocratic armies like our own, it is infinitely more obvious and pressing in the case of a democratic one like that of France. For consider what happens in such an army when this control is not exercised. You begin, suppose, with a regiment of a thousand men and forty officers. Every one of the thousand is aspiring to be one of the forty; and, in the nature of things, you find disappointed ambition gradually developing into discontent. To remedy it, you create a fresh battalion, and promote from the ranks of the old one a sufficient number of men to make up the complement of officers which the whole regiment requires.* The discontent is appeased for the present; but what

* It is scarcely necessary to caution the reader that I am illustrating the actual operation of a principle, not stating the process with technical exactness.

have you done to appease it? Simply this, you have doubled the strength of its inevitable cause. A year or two at most, and the whole process must be repeated—repeated on a larger scale, and under the pressure of a more urgent necessity. Instead of a thousand men aspiring to forty prizes, you will have two thousand aspiring to eighty; and if you could not stand against the first demand, what will you do against the second? Nor is this all; for what is true of the lowest rank is true in its degree of every other; so that the officer, instead of checking, will rather lead and stimulate the discontent, anxious himself to profit by a clamour for augmentation, which can only grow more confident in proportion to its success and more formidable in proportion to its extent. If that clamour is silenced at all, it must be silenced at the outset; and a democratic government which does not intend that the army should fix, year by year, the measure of its own expansion, must refuse, at once and absolutely, the financial means which that expansion presupposes. The task may be difficult and invidious for a while; but it cannot be persevered in without ultimate success. For only let the due relation be preserved between the army and the people, and those modes of thought which have become habitual in society at large will gradually win their way into the sphere of military life. The recruit will be penetrated more and more with the spirit that pervades the nation; and the soldier will become an orderly citizen exercising the profession of arms, rather than a daring adventurer made free of the brotherhood of brigands. Thus even a democratic army may ultimately exist without danger to the state, and become, like other armies, the safeguard of society, instead of its destruction or its terror.

This is the end to which all statesmen, worthy of the name, have always striven to conduct the antagonism between the military and civil life of France. I have no desire to write a panegyric on Louis Philippe; I am neither a partisan of his ministers, nor an admirer of his character; but I cannot look back on the history of his government without perceiving how steadily, courageously, and intelligently it pursued, on this fundamental question, the only course which is consistent with the true dignity of France and the foremost interests of European civilisation. The pacific policy that marked his reign was maintained against difficulties of no common strength, and at the cost of no small obloquy. It was from first to last a deliberate sacrifice of present glory to future prosperity; and it proceeded on a firm though quiet resistance to the unceasing demands of a dissatisfied army. That resistance was possible, because it was backed by the

whole strength of the tax-paying classes, making itself seen, heard, and felt through the medium of parliament and the press. The government was identified with the interests of property, and the interests of property were hostile as well to the immediate outlay as to the ultimate consequences entailed by large military establishments. Hence the army expenditure was kept within moderate limits, and the army itself maintained in its proper subordination to society; so that full scope was given to the internal development of a people whose energy can never fail to achieve great results, whether it is employed to advance the cause of civilisation or to trouble the peace of Europe.

But when the parliament and the free press had passed away, a new order of things arose in France. The central power of the state, no longer upheld by the visible concurrence of the moneyed classes, was driven of necessity to seek in some other quarter a support equivalent to that which it had lost. Such a support was only to be found in the army; and accordingly, each party in the great national antagonism found its position reversed. The influence and direction of the executive government was transferred from the civil to the military side. The army had conquered society; and its needs, its hopes, and its desires, became the inspirations of the national policy. The revolution was instantaneous, and yet the triumph was complete; for property, like freedom, holds her own by a tenure of unceasing vigilance and unrelaxing effort. Things drift by nature towards anarchy and despotism, and a single moment of neglect or weakness may undo the work which it has taken a generation to accomplish. And so it was in France. I assign no character of moral good or evil to the act of the 2nd of December; I am speaking of it only in its consequences, and, as far as my argument is concerned, it is a matter of indifference whether the act itself was a necessity or a crime. Whichever it may have been, it swept away the painful labour of six-and-thirty years, and threw back French society upon the principles from which it was emancipated at the fall of the first Napoleon. From that moment a war became a necessity, and all that remained to do was to inaugurate an enemy and an occasion.

I say to "inaugurate" simply, not to find, for both were found already. The men who planned the 2nd of December cannot be accused of either shortsightedness or precipitation; and they had not thrown themselves on the army without having first counted the cost and determined the method of payment. Already the question of the Holy Places had formed a subject of diplomatic communication between Turkey and

the Catholic powers; and the joint remonstrances of Austria, France, Spain, Belgium, Portugal, Sardinia, and Naples, were bearing with irresistible force on the ministers of the Porte. I hear men talk sometimes about "the zeal France showed for the Holy Places" at this eventful crisis. I question neither the sincerity nor the devotion of the French people; but if their government was actuated by a simple "zeal for the Holy Places," I wonder why it suddenly forsook the companionship of the other Catholic powers, and started for itself alone that claim of a protectorate over the Latin Christians which first stirred Russia to the energetic reassertion of her claim to a protectorate over the Greeks. There are two ways of maintaining a point,—one when we want to carry it in earnest, and the other when we want to connect ourselves with it in appearance; and I do not think any impartial man can read carefully through that long and dreary correspondence that preceded the Russian war, without concluding that the French government was far more anxious to appear the champion of Catholicism than to promote its interests, and deliberately aimed from the commencement at provoking Russia to some act which, in the eyes of Europe, might justify a declaration of war. Unfortunately, Russia fell into the snare, and committed herself to the active prosecution of a scheme which France had every right to baffle if she could, and which England was compelled, by the law of self-preservation, to resist with her utmost strength.

The two Western powers fought together as allies; but they had entered into the war from different motives, and they carried it on with different aims. The object of the English government was to restrain the power of Russia within certain limits; the object of the French government was to distribute promotion through an eager army, and to confer *prestige* on a new dynasty. I need not recount the history of our own success and failure. We conquered in the field, and then refused the offer of every thing we went to war to secure; then flung away more blood and treasure, and gained more victories; and at last made peace at Paris on terms less advantageous than those which we had previously rejected at Vienna. But the French gained every thing they sought; for fighting and victory were to them not means but ends. The other powers assembled at the congress to define and accept their respective gains or losses; but the gains of France, if I may say so, had already defined themselves, and she was *ipso facto* in possession of them. Thus, while her rivals were engaged in settling the bases of an immediate arrangement, she was free to look out into the

future, and by this means to secure at once the credit of apparent moderation in her victory, and the solid advantage of disposing circumstances towards the attainment of her next design.

What that design was, I cannot understand how any thoughtful and observant politician can have doubted from the time when the proceedings of the Congress were made public. There were indications of it, indeed,—clear enough, I should have thought, for most men's satisfaction,—even long before that time. The present representative of the house of Savoy is not distinguished for the strength or generosity of his devotional aspirations; and even a more ardent champion of Catholicism might have shrunk from plunging his actual kingdom of Sardinia into a war for the purpose of consolidating French influence in his titular kingdom of Jerusalem. Few things had less to do than chivalry or religion with the presence of the Piedmontese troops in the Crimea. The minister who sent them there is a man as subtle and long-sighted in his schemes as he is vigorous and reckless in their execution; and he had gauged with perfect accuracy the nature and necessities of the Napoleonic policy. However blinded other statesmen may have been, or thought it right to seem, Count Cavour at least never doubted, and never professed to doubt, that the French alliance, once effectually made, was sure of its consummation on the plains of Lombardy. The Sardinian contingent was the first instalment of its price; and I am certain that, in the winter of 1855, every one in Piedmontese society, in the slightest degree competent to form an opinion on the subject, was convinced that at all events it was meant to be so. There was no fighting "for fighting's sake." The ministerialists saw that the French empire could not possibly sustain a peace of long duration, and their aim was to determine the direction of a war which they were conscious could not be prevented.

The Congress soon revealed the Sardo-French conspiracy to all who had eyes to see. Outnumbered by enemies, feebly supported by lukewarm friends, the patient vigilance of Count Buol nevertheless secured substantial advantages for his country. But from the beginning it was clear that France and Sardinia were politically one,—united alike in hostility to Austria, and in overstrained anxiety to gain the friendship of the Russian court. I was at Turin when the peace was signed; and I remember well the feeling there, and through Piedmont, when Count Cavour came back from Paris. Never had he been so idolised by the small knot of men that form his party, never so distrusted by his casual supporters, never

more profoundly unpopular amongst the great body of his countrymen. It was the moment of all others when a prudent opposition, based on the old traditions of the monarchy, and led by men whose names still sound as household words among the people, might have gathered to itself the mass of disturbed opinion and offended patriotism that was floating through the nation, and might have won its way to the direction of affairs with the support of an overwhelming majority.

But, unhappily, the Conservative opposition in the Piedmontese Chambers had scarcely an organised existence. It would pain me deeply if I seemed to speak with less than justice of men for whom I entertain a feeling higher than respect; but the state of Piedmont for the last three years has been a proof, which no one can gainsay or overlook, of the error committed by Charles Albert's ministers when they refused to recognise and work the constitutional government of his successor. I can understand their reluctance to accept the change; I can sympathise with their disgust at the instruments and circumstances of its accomplishment. But it was not from them that the system which had passed away deserved so long a mourning;* and their history since 1848 has only added one more to the already redundant list of proofs how rarely a secession from the political arena has any other effect than to weaken the principle which it withdraws from sight, and to throw back the day of reaction. That day would have sooner come to Piedmont if there had been a vigorous and united party struggling for it. For the Cavour policy was one essentially hostile to the genius of parliamentary institutions; and it must have crumbled away if those institutions had been invoked against it. It was simply a policy of territorial aggrandisement. To that one idea it was always ready to sacrifice social amelioration and commercial prosperity, as well as national independence and religious feeling. "To suckle armies and dry-nurse the land" was the necessary means to its success; and no policy that rests on such a foundation can ever permanently maintain itself in a country where the tax-paying classes determine the extent of their own taxation. Peace and retrenchment were cries to which men would have rallied, even before they were sick of their religious perversity, or apprehensive for their national independence. But there were no leaders to mould the discontent into a systematic opposition; and it wasted itself accordingly in mere indolent fretfulness.

This was the state of things at the conclusion of the Rus-

* See *Memorandum Storico-Politico del Conte Clemente Solaro della Margarita*.

sian war. Then, indeed, their real position and responsibility appeared to break on the Conservatives; and at that eleventh hour, when they ought to have been entering on the fruits of their labour, they began the labour itself. It was a race against time; for the whole question was, whether Count Cavour could bring the French army across the Alps before the Conservative party could be sufficiently organised to drive him from power. The first success of the reaction was enough to show what might have been its issue if it had commenced before; but every year of delay had accumulated difficulties in the way of its advance. It depended on the tact of leaders who had forgotten the habits of public life, and on the steady adhesion of followers who had never been taught to combine: and it had to form itself in the face of enemies to whom long use had given the instinct of supremacy, and who found in the very baseness of their aim a guarantee for its eventual success.

For the hope of the Cavour administration was not in the principles it claimed to represent, or the domestic results it was enabled to accomplish; it rested simply on the adroitness with which it could contrive to pander to the necessities of a foreign power. Month by month, as the three years of peace wore on, these miserable necessities grew more degrading and more imperative. The Russian war, instead of permanently satisfying the French army, had done nothing more than increase its numbers, raise its hopes, inflame its passions, and augment its power. The appetite for war was strengthened by what it fed on; and the army, from being the support and favourite of the government, rose by sure steps to the position of its master. Nor was this all. To carry on the Russian war, France borrowed a hundred millions sterling, adding three millions sterling in perpetuity to the amount of her yearly liabilities. It was a burden greater than she could bear, and her finances have been staggering under it ever since. I do not profess to fathom all the depths of those mysterious balance-sheets by which it pleases M. Magne to test the periodical credulity of Europe; but when he takes the unexpended surplus of a loan contracted one year, and deliberately sets it down as an item in the revenue of the succeeding year, I think he over-estimates the capacity of his dupes, and the market-value of his own *ἠθικὴ πίστις*. One of our popular caricaturists has drawn the picture of a spendthrift, whose habit it was to reckon as a pure addition to his capital every shilling by which necessity or persuasion had succeeded in reducing the amount of his intended expenditure. The portrait has been condemned as

exaggerated and unreal; but it is more than justified by a finance-minister who gravely propounds the proverb, that "a penny saved is twice got," not by way of a moral reflection, but as the simple statement of an arithmetical fact. Budgets constructed on such a principle are amusing enough in themselves; but unhappily they pass into the region of sober earnest when we think of the embarrassments they so unwillingly reveal, and the recklessness they so conspicuously display. There is generally but a short step between falsifying your own accounts and coveting the property of other people; and it is a step from which, when it came in his way, M. Magne had not the weakness to recoil. I do full justice to his difficulties. He had to deal with an overgrown army, an extravagant court, an empty exchequer, and a mortgaged revenue. I wish also to do justice to his dexterity; and therefore I admit at once that it was not from enemies or foreigners that he first endeavoured to obtain the necessary supplies. Like other people in difficulties, he threw himself on the confidence of his friends. If there is any class of educated men whose calling and pursuits especially withdraw them from the influence of commercial interests, and render them more liable than other men to be imposed on by financial sophisms, it is, of course, the clergy; and to the clergy M. Magne appealed. Every body remembers the fallacies by which the French government endeavoured last summer to cajole the guardians of Church property. They were specious enough, but, happily for the intended victims, they were unsuccessful; and with their failure vanished the last hope of satisfying the immediate exigencies of the state by any scheme of mere domestic spoliation.

Thus has the present grown out of the past by a natural if not inevitable sequence. Beneath the pressure of an omnipotent army, demanding pay and eager for promotion, France has been driven to recommence her desolating career of aggression. By the state of Sardinian politics—the infinite baseness of one party, and the deplorable short-sightedness of the other—she has found her way prepared towards a contest which will flatter the traditional jealousy of her people, while it gratifies the dynastic malice of her ruler. The progress of her own financial embarrassment has defined the moment of the outbreak; and at last that crisis has arrived to which, for seven years, the enemies of Napoleonism have looked forward with a deep and changeless confidence. Their long-derided warnings are now justified before the world. Without a provocation, with scarcely a pretence, France has gathered up her strength to wrestle, life against life, with

the Conservative force of Europe. For this is no mere contest about the boundary of empires, or the faith of treaties, or the mutual antipathy of long-estranged and hostile races. It has a vaster significance, and tends to a more awful issue. Once more the first-born of democracy has gone forth on her impious apostolate; once more the plains of Lombardy are flushing with the crimson harvest of her guilt:

“Ecco la fiera con la coda aguzza,
Che passa i monti, e rompe mura ed armi;
Ecco colei che tutto 'l mondo appuzza.”*

The dry bones of the first Empire are waking into renovated life; and the struggle is for principles that lie deep at the very foundations of human society. For Napoleonism is one and the same through all the phases of its history,—a despotism based on social equality, upheld by military power, aggressive as the first condition of its existence, and propagandist by the constitution of its nature. No healing ever follows on the track of its invading armies; no generous aspirations ever gather round its victorious banner. It makes war, not in obedience to the call of duty, but to slake the degrading thirst for fame. And when it conquers, it conquers only to reverse the triumphs of civilisation, to give back all that law and freedom have won from the dark empire of material force. Σίγμα.

ON CONSULTING THE FAITHFUL IN MATTERS OF DOCTRINE.

A QUESTION has arisen among persons of theological knowledge and fair and candid minds, about the wording and the sense of a passage in the *Rambler* for May. It admits to my own mind of so clear and satisfactory an explanation, that I should think it unnecessary to intrude myself, an anonymous person, between the conductors and readers of this Magazine, except that, as in dogmatic works the replies made to objections often contain the richest matter, so here too, plain remarks on a plain subject may open to the minds of others profitable thoughts, which are more due to their own superior intelligence than to the very words of the writer.

The *Rambler*, then, has these words at p. 122: “In the preparation of a dogmatic definition, the faithful are consulted, as lately in the instance of the Immaculate Conception.” Now

* Dante, *Inferno*, canto 17.

two questions bearing upon doctrine have been raised on this sentence, putting aside the question of fact as regards the particular instance cited, which must follow the decision on the doctrinal questions: viz. first, whether it can, with doctrinal correctness, be said that an *appeal* to the faithful is one of the preliminaries of a definition of doctrine; and secondly, granting that the faithful are taken into account, still, whether they can correctly be said to be *consulted*. I shall remark on both these points, and I shall begin with the second.

§ 1.

Now doubtless, if a divine were expressing himself formally, and in Latin, he would not commonly speak of the laity being "consulted" among the preliminaries of a dogmatic definition, because the technical, or even scientific, meaning of the word "consult" is to "consult *with*," or to "take *counsel*." But the English word "consult," in its popular and ordinary use, is not so precise and narrow in its meaning; it is doubtless a word expressive of trust and deference, but not of submission. It includes the idea of inquiring into a matter of *fact*, as well as asking a judgment. Thus we talk of "consulting our barometer" about the weather:—the barometer only attests the *fact* of the state of the atmosphere. In like manner, we may consult a watch or a sun-dial about the time of day. A physician consults the pulse of his patient; but not in the same sense in which his patient consults *him*. It is but an index of the state of his health. Ecclesiastes says, "*Qui observat ventum, non seminat*;" we might translate it, "he who consults," without meaning that we ask the wind's opinion. This being considered, it was, I conceive, quite allowable for a writer, who was not teaching or treating theology, but, as it were, conversing, to say, as in the passage in question, "In the preparation of a dogmatic definition, the faithful are consulted." Doubtless their advice, their opinion, their judgment on the question of definition is not asked; but the matter of fact, viz. their belief, *is* sought for, as a testimony to that apostolical tradition, on which alone any doctrine whatsoever can be defined. In like manner, we may "consult" the liturgies or the rites of the Church; not that they speak, not that they can take any part whatever in the definition, for they are documents or customs; but they are witnesses to the antiquity or universality of the doctrines which they contain, and about which they are "consulted." And, in like manner, I certainly understood the writer in the *Rambler* to mean (and I think any lay reader might so understand him) that the *fidelium sensus* and *consensus* is a branch of evidence

which it is natural or necessary for the Church to regard and consult, before she proceeds to any definition, from its intrinsic cogency; and by consequence, that it ever has been so regarded and consulted. And the writer's use of the word "opinion" in the foregoing sentence, and his omission of it in the sentence in question, seemed to show that, though the two cases put therein were analogous, they were not identical.

Having said as much as this, I go further, and maintain that the word "consulted," used as it was used, was in no respect unadvisable, except so far as it distressed any learned and good men, who identified it with the Latin. I might, indeed, even have defended the word as it was used, in the Latin sense of it. Regnier both uses it of the laity and explains it. "*Cùm receptam apud populos traditionem consulunt et sequuntur Episcopi, non illos habent pro magistris et ducibus, &c.*" (*De Eccles. Christ.* p. i. § 1, c. i., ed. Migne, col. 234.) But in my bountifulness I will give up this use of the word as untheological; still I will maintain that the true theological sense is unknown to all *but* theologians. Accordingly, the use of it in the *Rambler* was in no sense dangerous to any lay reader, who, if he knows Latin, still is not called upon, in the structure of his religious ideas, to draw those careful lines and those fine distinctions, which in theology itself are the very means of anticipating and repelling heresy. The laity would not have a truer, or a clearer, or a different view of the doctrine itself, though the sentence had run, "in the preparation of a dogmatic decree, regard is had to the sense of the faithful;" or, "there is an appeal to the general voice of the faithful;" or, "*inquiry* is made into the belief of the Christian people;" or, "the definition is not made without a previous *reference* to what the faithful will think of it and say to it;" or though any other form of words had been used, stronger or weaker, expressive of the same general idea, viz. that *the sense of the faithful is not left out of the question* by the Holy See among the preliminary acts of defining a doctrine.

Now I shall go on presently to remark on the proposition itself which is conveyed in the words on which I have been commenting; here, however, I will first observe, that such misconceptions as I have been setting right will and must occur, from the nature of the case, whenever we speak on theological subjects in the vernacular; and if we do not use the vernacular, I do not see how the bulk of the Catholic people are to be catechised or taught at all. English has innovated on the Latin sense of its own Latin words; and if we are to speak according to the conditions of the language,

and are to make ourselves intelligible to the multitude, we shall necessarily run the risk of startling those who are resolved to act as mere critics and scholastics in the process of popular instruction.

This divergence from a classical or ecclesiastical standard is a great inconvenience, I grant; but we cannot remodel our mother-tongue. *Crimen* does not properly mean *crime*; *amiable* does not yet convey the idea of *amabilis*; *compassio* is not *compassion*; *princeps* is not a *prince*; *disputatio* is not a *dispute*; *prævenire* is not *to prevent*. *Cicero imperator* is not *the Emperor Cicero*; *scriptor egregius* is not an *egregious writer*; *virgo singularis* is not a *singular virgin*; *retractare dicta* is not *to retract what he has said*; and, as we know from the sacred passage, *traducere* is not necessarily *to traduce*.

Now this is not merely sharp writing, for mistakes do in matter of fact occur not unfrequently from this imperfect correspondence between theological Latin and English; showing that readers of English are bound ever to bear in mind that they are not reading Latin, and that learned divines must ever exercise charity in their interpretations of vernacular religious teaching.

For instance, I know of certain English sermons which were translated into French by some French priests. They, good and friendly men, were surprised to find in these compositions such language as "weak evidence and strong evidence," and "insufficient, probable, demonstrative evidence;" they read that "some writers had depreciated the evidences of religion," and that "the last century, when love was cold, was an age of evidences." *Evidentia*, they said, meant that luminousness which attends on demonstration, conviction, certainty; how can it be more or less? how can it be unsatisfactory? how can a sane man disparage it? how can it be connected with religious coldness? The simple explanation of the difficulty was, that the writer was writing for his own people, and that in English "an evidence" is not *evidentia*.

Another instance. An excellent Italian religious, now gone to his reward, was reading a work of the same author; and he came upon a sentence to the effect, I think, that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was to be held with "implicit" faith. He was perplexed and concerned. He thought the writer held that the Church did not explicitly teach, had not explicitly defined, the dogma; that is, he confused the English meaning of the word, according to which it is a sort of correlative to *imperative*, meaning simple, unconditional, absolute, with its sense in theology.

It is not so exactly apposite to refer,—yet I will refer,—

to another instance, as supplying a general illustration of the point I am urging. It was in a third country that a lecturer spoke in terms of disparagement of "Natural Theology," on the ground of its deciding questions of revelation by reasonings from physical phenomena. It was objected to him, that *Naturalis Theologia* embraced *all* truths and arguments from natural reason bearing upon the Divine Being and Attributes. Certainly he would have been the last to depreciate what he had ever made the paramount preliminary science to Christian faith; but he spoke according to the sense of those to whom his words might come. He considered that in the Protestant school of Paley and other popular writers, the idea of Natural Theology had practically merged in a scientific view of the argument from Design.

Once more. Supposing a person were to ask me whether a friend, who has told me the fact in confidence, had written a certain book, and I were to answer, "Well, if he did, he certainly would tell *me*," and the inquirer went away satisfied that he did *not* write it,—I do not see that I have done any thing to incur the reproach of the English word "equivocation;" I have but adopted a mode of turning-off a difficult question, to which any one may be obliged any day to have recourse. I am not speaking of spontaneous and gratuitous assertions, statements on solemn occasions, or answers to formal authorities. I am speaking of impertinent or unjustifiable questions; and I should like to know the man who thinks himself bound to say every thing to every one. Physicians evade the questions of sick persons about themselves; friends break bad news gradually, and with temporary concealments, to those whom it may shock. Parents shuffle with their children. Statesmen, ministers in Parliament, baffle adversaries in every possible way short of a direct infringement of veracity. When St. Athanasius saw that he was pursued on the Nile by the imperial officers, he turned round his boat and met them; when they came up to his party and hailed them, and asked whether they had seen any thing of Athanasius, Athanasius cried out, "O yes, he is not far from you;" and off the vessels went in different directions as swiftly as they could go, each boat on its own errand, the pursuer and the pursued. I do not see that there is in any of these instances what is expressed by the English word "equivocation;" but it is the *æquivocatio* of a Latin treatise; and when Protestants hear that *æquivocamus sine scrupulo*, they are shocked at the notion of our "unscrupulous equivocation."

Now, in saying all this, I must not be supposed to be for-

getful of the sacred and imperative duty of preserving with religious exactness all those theological terms which are ecclesiastically recognised as portions of dogmatic statements, such as *Trinity, Person, Consubstantial, Nature, Transubstantiation, Sacrament, &c.* It would be unpardonable for a Catholic to teach "justification by faith only," and say that he meant by "faith" *fides formata*, or "justification without works," and say that he meant by "works" the works of the Jewish ritual; but granting all this fully, still if our whole religious phraseology is, as a matter of duty, to be modelled in strict conformity to theological Latin, neither the poor nor children will understand us. I have always fancied that to preachers great license was allowed, not only in the wording, but even in the matter of their discourses; they exaggerate and are rhetorical, and they are understood *più* as speaking *more prædicatorio*. I have always fancied that, when Catholics were accused of hyperbolical language towards the Blessed Virgin, it was replied that devotion was not the measure of doctrine; nor surely is the vernacular of a magazine writer. I do not see that I am wrong in considering that a periodical, not treating theology *ex professo*, but accidentally alluding to an ecclesiastical act, commits no real offence if it uses an unscientific word, since it speaks, not *more digladiatorio*, but *colloquialiter*.

I shall conclude this head of my subject with allusion to a passage in the history of St. Dionysius the Great, Bishop of Alexandria, though it is beyond my purpose; but I like to quote a saint whom, *multis nominibus* (not "with many names," or "by many nouns"), I have always loved most of all the Ante-Nicene Fathers. It relates to an attack which was made on his orthodoxy; a very serious matter. Now I know every one will be particular on his own special science or pursuits. I am the last man to find fault with such particularity. Drill-sergeants think much of deportment; hard logicians come down with a sledge-hammer even on a Plato who does not happen to enumerate in his beautiful sentences all the argumentative considerations which go to make up his conclusion; scholars are horrified, as if with sensible pain, at the perpetration of a false quantity. I am far from ridiculing, despising, or even undervaluing such precision; it is for the good of every art and science that it should have vigilant guardians. Nor am I comparing such precision (far from it) with that true religious zeal which leads theologians to keep the sacred Ark of the Covenant in every letter of its dogma, as a tremendous deposit for which they are responsible. In this curious sceptical world, such sensitive-

ness is the only human means by which the treasure of faith can be kept inviolate. There is a woe in Scripture against the unfaithful shepherd. We do not blame the watch-dog because he sometimes flies at the wrong person. I conceive the force, the peremptoriness, the sternness, with which the Holy See comes down upon the vagrant or the robber, trespassing upon the enclosure of revealed truth, is the only sufficient antagonist to the power and subtlety of the world, to imperial comprehensiveness, monarchical selfishness, nationalism, the liberalism of philosophy, the encroachments and usurpations of science. I grant, I maintain all this; and after this avowal, lest I be misunderstood, I venture to introduce my notice of St. Dionysius. He was accused on a far worse charge, and before a far more formidable tribunal, than commonly befalls a Catholic writer; for he was brought up before the Holy See on a denial of our Lord's divinity. He had been controverting with the Sabellians; and he was in consequence accused of the doctrine to which Arius afterwards gave his name, that is, of considering our Lord a creature. He says, writing in his defence, that when he urged his opponents with the argument that "a vine and a vine-dresser were not the same," neither, therefore, were the "Father and the Son," these were not the only illustrations that he made use of, nor those on which he dwelt, for he also spoke of "a root and a plant," "a fount and a stream," which are not only *distinct* from each other, but of one and the same *nature*. Then he adds, "But my accusers have no eyes to see this portion of my treatise; but they take up two little words detached from the context, and proceed to discharge them at me as pebbles from a sling."* If even a saint's words are not always precise enough to allow of being made a dogmatic text, much less are those of any modern periodical.

The conclusion I would draw from all I have been saying is this: Without deciding whether or not it is advisable to introduce points of theology into popular works, and especially whether it is advisable for laymen to do so, still, if this actually *is* done, we are not to expect in them that perfect accuracy of expression which is demanded in a Latin treatise or a lecture *ex cathedrá*; and if there be a want of this exactness, we must not at once think it proceeds from self-will and undutifulness in the writers.

§ 2.

Now I come to the *matter* of what the writer in the *Rambler* really said, putting aside the question of the *word*-

* Athan. de Sent. Dion. 8.

ing; and I begin by expressing my belief that, whatever he may be willing to admit on the score of theological Latinity in the use of the word "consult" when applied to the faithful, yet one thing he cannot deny, viz. that in using it, he implied, from the very force of the term, that they are treated by the Holy See, on occasions such as that specified, with attention and consideration.

Then follows the question, Why? and the answer is plain, viz. because the body of the faithful is one of the witnesses to the fact of the tradition of revealed doctrine, and because their *consensus* through Christendom is the voice of the Infallible Church.

I think I am right in saying that the tradition of the Apostles, committed to the whole Church in its various constituents and functions *per modum unius*, manifests itself variously at various times: sometimes by the mouth of the episcopacy, sometimes by the doctors, sometimes by the people, sometimes by liturgies, rites, ceremonies, and customs, by events, disputes, movements, and all those other phenomena which are comprised under the name of history. It follows that none of these channels of tradition may be treated with disrespect; granting at the same time fully, that the gift of discerning, discriminating, defining, promulgating, and enforcing any portion of that tradition resides solely in the *Ecclesia docens*.

One man will lay more stress on one aspect of doctrine, another on another; for myself, I am accustomed to lay great stress on the *consensus fidelium*, and I will say how it has come about.

1. It had long been to me a difficulty, that I could not find certain portions of the defined doctrine of the Church in ecclesiastical writers. I was at Rome in the year 1847; and then I had the great advantage and honour of seeing Fathers Perrone and Passaglia, and having various conversations with them on this point. The point of difficulty was this, that up to the date of the definition of certain articles of doctrine respectively, there was so very deficient evidence from existing documents that Bishops, doctors, theologians, held them. I do not mean to say that I expressed my difficulty in this formal shape; but that what passed between us in such interviews as they were kind enough to give me, ran into or impinged upon this question. Nor would I ever dream of making them answerable for the impression which their answers made on me; but, speaking simply on my own responsibility, I should say that, while Father Passaglia seemed to maintain that the Ante-Nicene writers were clear

in their testimonies in behalf (*e. g.*) of the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and Justification, expressly praising and making much of the Anglican Bishop Bull; Father Perrone, on the other hand, not speaking, indeed, directly upon those particular doctrines, but rather on such as I will presently introduce in his own words, seemed to me to say "*transeat*" to the alleged fact which constituted the difficulty, and to lay a great stress on what he considered to be the *sensus* and *consensus fidelium*, as a compensation for whatever deficiency there might be of patristical testimony in behalf of various points of the Catholic dogma.

2. I should have been led to fancy, perhaps, that he was shaping his remarks in the direction in which he considered he might be especially serviceable to myself, who had been accustomed to account for the (supposed) phenomena in another way, had it not been for his work on the Immaculate Conception, which I read the next year with great interest, and which was passing through the press when I saw him. I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing my gratitude and attachment to a venerable man, who never grudged me his valuable time.

But now for his treatise, to which I have referred, so far as it speaks of the *sensus fidelium*, and of its bearing upon the doctrine, of which his work treats, and upon its definition.

(1.) He states the historical *fact* of such *sensus*. Speaking of the "*Ecclesiæ sensus*" on the subject, he says that, though the liturgies of the Feast of the Conception "*satis apertè patefaciant quid Ecclesia antiquitus de hoc senserit argumento*," yet it may be worth while to add some direct remarks on the sense itself of the Church. Then he says, "*Ex duplici fonte eum colligi posse arbitramur, tum scilicet ex pastorum, tum ex fidelium sese gerendi ratione*" (pp. 74, 75). Let it be observed, he not only joins together the *pastores* and *fideles*, but contrasts them; I mean (for it will bear on what is to follow), the "*faithful*" do not *include* the "*pastors*."

(2.) Next he goes on to describe the relation of that *sensus fidelium* to the *sensus Ecclesiæ*. He says, that to inquire into the sense of the Church on any question, is nothing else but to investigate towards which side of it she has more inclined. And the "*indicia et manifestationes hujus propensionis*" are her public acts, liturgies, feasts, prayers, "*pastorum ac fidelium in unum veluti conspiratio*" (p. 101). Again, at p. 109, joining together in one this twofold consent of pastors and people, he speaks of the "*unanimis pastorum ac fidelium consensio . . . per liturgias, per festa, per euchologia, per fidei controversias, per conciones patefacta*."

(3.) These various "indicia" are also the *instrumenta traditionis*, and vary one with another in the evidence which they give in favour of particular doctrines; so that the strength of one makes up in a particular case for the deficiency of another, and the strength of the "sensus communis fidelium" can make up (*e.g.*) for the silence of the Fathers. "Istiusmodi instrumenta interdum simul conjunctè conspirare possunt ad traditionem aliquam apostolicam atque divinam patefaciendam, interdum vero seorsum. . . Perperam nonnulli solent ad inficiandam traditionis alicujus existentiam urgere silentium Patrum . . . quid enim si silentium istud alio pacto . . . compensetur?" (p. 139). He instances this from St. Irenæus and Tertullian in the "Successio Episcoporum," who transmit the doctrines "tum activi operâ ministerii, tum usu et praxi, tum institutis ritibus . . . adeò ut catholica atque apostolica doctrina inoculata . . . fuerit . . . communi Ecclesiæ cœtui" (p. 142).

(4.) He then goes on to speak directly of the force of the "sensus fidelium," as distinct (not separate) from the teaching of their pastors. "*Præstantissimi* theologi maximam *probandi* vim huic communi sensui inesse uno ore fatentur. Etenim Canus, 'In quæstione fidei,' inquit, 'communis fidelis populi sensus haud levem facit fidem'" (p. 143). He gives another passage from him in a note, which he introduces with the words, "Illud *præclarè* addit;" what Canus adds is, "Quæro ex te, quando de rebus Christianæ fidei inter nos contendimus, non de philosophiæ decretis, utrùm potius *quærendum* est, quid philosophi atque ethnici, an quid homines Christiani, et *doctrinâ et fide* instituti, *sentiant*?" Now certainly "quærere quid sentiant homines doctrinâ et fide instituti," though not asking advice, is an act implying not a little deference on the part of the persons addressing towards the parties addressed.

Father Perrone continues, "Gregorius verò de Valentiâ fusius vim ejusmodi fidelium consensus evolvit. 'Est enim,' inquit, 'in *definitionibus fidei* habenda ratio, quoad fieri potest, consensus fidelium.'" Here, again, "habere rationem," to have regard to, is an act of respect and consideration. However, Gregory continues, "Quoniam et ii sanè, quatenus *ex ipsis* constat Ecclesia, sic *Spiritu Sancto assistente*, divinas revelationes *integrè et purè conservant*, ut omnes illi quidem aberrare non possunt. . . . Illud solùm contendo: Si quando de re aliquâ in materie *religionis* controversia [controversâ?] constaret fidelium omnium concordem esse sententiam (solet autem id constare, vel ex ipsâ praxi alicujus cultûs communiter apud christianos populos receptâ, vel ex *scandalo et*

offensione communi, quæ opinione aliquâ oritur, &c.) meritò posse et debere Pontificem illâ niti, ut quæ esset Ecclesiæ sententia infallibilis" (p. 144). Thus Gregory says that, in controversy about a matter of faith, the consent of all the faithful has such a force in the proof of this side or that, that the Supreme Pontiff *is able and ought to rest* upon it, as being the *judgment or sentiment* of the *infallible Church*. These are surely exceedingly strong words; not that I take them to mean strictly that infallibility is *in* the "*consensus fidelium*," but that that "*consensus*" is an *indicium* or *instrumentum* to us of the judgment of that Church which *is* infallible.

Father Perrone proceeds to quote from Petavius, who supplies us with the following striking admonition from St. Paulinus, viz. "*ut de omnium fidelium ore pendeamus, quia in omnem fidelem Spiritus Dei spirat.*"

Petavius speaks thus, as he quotes him (p. 156): "*Movet me, ut in eam [viz. piam] sententiam sim propensior, communis maximus sensus fidelium omnium.*" By "*movet me*" he means, that he *attends* to what the *cætus fidelium* says: this is certainly not passing over the *fideles*, but making much of them.

In a later part of his work (p. 186), Father Perrone speaks of the "*consensus fidelium*" under the strong image of a *seal*. After mentioning various arguments in favour of the Immaculate Conception, such as the testimony of so many universities, religious bodies, theologians, &c., he continues, "*Hæc demum omnia firmissimo veluti sigillo obsignat totius christiani populi consensus.*"

(5.) He proceeds to give several instances, in which the definition of doctrine was made in consequence of nothing else but the "*sensus fidelium*" and the "*juge et vivum magisterium*" of the Church.

For his meaning of the "*juge et vivum magisterium Ecclesiæ*," he refers us to his *Prælectiones* (part ii. § 2, c. ii.). In that passage I do not see that he defines the sense of the word; but I understand him to mean that high authoritative voice or act which is the Infallible Church's prerogative, inasmuch as she is the teacher of the nations; and which is a sufficient warrant to all men for a doctrine being true and being *de fide*, by the mere fact of its formally occurring. It is distinct from, and independent of, tradition, though never in fact separated from it. He says, "*Fit ut traditio dogmatica identificetur cum ipsâ Ecclesiæ doctrinâ, a quâ separari nequit; qua propter, etsi documenta deficerent omnia, solum hoc vivum et juge magisterium satis esset ad cognoscendam doctrinam divinitus traditam, habito præsertim respectu ad solennes Christi promissiones*" (p. 303).

This being understood, he speaks of several points of faith which have been determined and defined by the "magisterium" of the Church and, as to tradition, on the "consensus fidelium," prominently, if not solely.

The most remarkable of these is the "dogma de visione Dei beatificâ" possessed by souls after purgatory and before the day of judgment; a point which Protestants, availing themselves of the comment of the Benedictines of St. Maur upon St. Ambrose, are accustomed to urge in controversy. "Nemo est qui nesciat," says Father Perrone, "quot utriusque Ecclesiæ, tum Græcæ tum Latinæ, Patres contrarium sensisse visi sunt" (p. 147). He quotes in a note the words of the Benedictine editor, as follows: "Propemodum incredibile videri potest, quàm in eâ quæstione sancti Patres ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus ad Gregorii XI. [Benedicti XII.] pontificatum florentinumque concilium, hoc est toto quatuordecim seculorum spatio, incerti ac parùm constantes exstiterint." Father Perrone continues: "Certè quidem in Ecclesiâ non deerat quoad hunc fidei articulum divina traditio; alioquin nunquam is definiri potuisset: verùm non omnibus illa erat comperta; divina eloquia haud satis in re sunt conspicua; *Patres*, ut vidimus, in varias abierunt sententias; *liturgiæ ipsæ* non modicam præ se ferunt difficultatem. *His omnibus succurrit* jure Ecclesiæ magisterium, *communis præterea fidelium sensus*; qui altè adeò defixum . . habebant mentibus, purgatas animas statim ad Deum videndum eoque fruendum admitti, ut non minimum eorum animi vel ex ipsâ controversiâ fuerint *offensi*, quæ sub Joanne XXII. agitabatur, et cujus definitio *diu nimis protrahebatur*." Now does not this imply that the tradition, on which the definition was made, was manifested in the *consensus fidelium* with a luminousness which the succession of Bishops, though many of them were "Sancti Patres ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus," did not furnish? that the definition was delayed till the *fideles* would bear the delay no longer? that it was made because of them and for their sake, because of their strong feelings? If so, surely, in plain English, most considerable deference was paid to the "sensus fidelium;" their opinion and advice indeed was not asked, but their testimony was taken, their feelings consulted, their impatience, I had almost said, feared.

In like manner, as regards the doctrine, though not the definition, of the Immaculate Conception, he says, not denying, of course, the availableness of the other "instrumenta traditionis" in this particular case, "Ratissimum est, Christi fideles omnes circa hunc articulum unius esse animi, idque ita, ut maximo afficerentur *scandalo*, si vel minima

de Immaculatâ Virginis Conceptione quæstio moveretur" (p. 156).

3. A year had hardly passed from the appearance of Fr. Perrone's book in England, when the Pope published his Encyclical Letter. In it he asked the Bishops of the Catholic world, "ut nobis significare velitis, quâ devotione vester clerus *populusque fidelis* erga Immaculatæ Virginis conceptionem sit animatus, et quo desiderio flagret, ut ejusmodi res ab apostolicâ sede decernatur;" that is, when it came to the point to take measures for the definition of the doctrine, he did lay a special stress on this particular preliminary, viz. the ascertainment of the feeling of the faithful both towards the doctrine and its definition; as the *Rambler* stated in the passage out of which this argument has arisen. It seems to me important to keep this in view, whatever becomes of the word "consulted," which, I have already said, is not to be taken in its ordinary Latin sense.

4. At length, in 1854, the definition took place, and the Pope's Bull containing it made its appearance. In it the Holy Father speaks as he had spoken in his Encyclical, viz. that although he *already* knew the sentiments of the Bishops, still he had wished to know the sentiments of the *people* also: "*Quamvis* nobis ex receptis postulationibus de definiendâ tandem aliquando Immaculatâ Virginis Conceptione *perspectus* esset plurimorum sociorum *Antistitum* sensus, tamen Encyclicas literas, &c. ad omnes Ven. FF. totius Catholici orbis sacrorum Antistites misimus, ut, adhibitis ad Deum precibus, nobis scripto *etiam* significarent, quæ esset suorum *fidelium* erga Immaculatam Deiparæ Conceptionem pietas et devotio," &c. And when, before the formal definition, he enumerates the various witnesses to the apostolicity of the doctrine, he sets down "divina eloquia, veneranda traditio, perpetuus Ecclesiæ sensus, singularis catholicorum Antistitum ac *fidelium* conspiratio." *Conspiratio*; the two, the Church teaching and the Church taught, are put together, as one twofold testimony, illustrating each other, and never to be divided.

5. A year or two passed, and the Bishop of Birmingham published his treatise on the doctrine. I close this portion of my paper with an extract from his careful view of the argument. "Nor should the universal conviction of pious Catholics be passed over, as of small account in the general argument; for that pious belief, and the devotion which springs from it, are the *faithful reflection* of the pastoral teaching" (p. 172). Reflection; that is, the people are a *mirror*, in which the Bishops see themselves. Well, I suppose a person may *consult* his glass, and in that way may know things

about himself which he can learn in no other way. This is what Fr. Perrone above seems to say has sometimes actually been the case, as in the instance of the "beatificatio" of the saints; at least he does not mention the "*pastorum ac fidelium conspiratio*" in reviewing the grounds of its definition, but simply the "*juge Ecclesiæ magisterium*" and the "*communis fidelium sensus*."

His lordship proceeds: "The more devout the faithful grew, the more devoted they showed themselves towards this mystery. And it is the devout who have the surest instinct in discerning the mysteries of which the Holy Spirit breathes the grace through the Church, and who, with as sure a tact, reject what is alien from her teaching. The common accord of the faithful has weighed much as an argument even with the most learned divines. St. Augustine says, that amongst many things which most justly held him in the bosom of the Catholic Church, was the 'accord of populations and of nations.' In another work he says, 'It seems that I have believed nothing but the confirmed opinion and the exceedingly wide-spread report of populations and of nations.' Elsewhere he says: 'In matters whereupon the Scripture has not spoken clearly, the custom of the people of God, or the institutions of our predecessors, are to be held as law.' In the same spirit St. Jerome argues, whilst defending the use of relics against Vigilantius: 'So the people of all the Churches who have gone out to meet holy relics, and have received them with so much joy, are to be accounted foolish'" (pp. 172, 173).

And here I might come to an end; but, having got so far, I am induced, before concluding, to suggest an historical instance of the same great principle, which Father Perrone does not draw out.

§ 3.

First, I will set down the various ways in which theologians put before us the bearing of the Consent of the faithful upon the manifestation of the tradition of the Church. Its *consensus* is to be regarded: 1. as a testimony to the fact of the apostolical dogma; 2. as a sort of instinct, or *φρόνημα*, deep in the bosom of the mystical body of Christ; 3. as a direction of the Holy Ghost; 4. as an answer to its prayer; 5. as a jealousy of error, which it at once feels as a scandal.

1. The first of these I need not enlarge upon, as it is illustrated in the foregoing passages from Father Perrone.

2. The second is explained in the well-known passages of Möhler's *Symbolique*; e.g. "*L'esprit de Dieu, qui gouverne*

et vivifie l'Eglise, enfante dans l'homme, en s'unissant à lui, *un instinct*, un tact éminemment chrétien, qui le conduit à toute vraie doctrine. . . . Ce sentiment commun, cette conscience de l'Eglise est la tradition dans le sens subjectif du mot. Qu'est-ce donc que la tradition considérée sous ce point de vue? C'est le sens chrétien existant dans l'Eglise, et transmis par l'Eglise; sens, toutefois, qu'on ne peut séparer des vérités qu'il contient, puisqu'il est formé de ces vérités et par ces vérités." Ap. Perrone, p. 142.

3. Cardinal Fisher seems to speak of the third, as he is quoted by Petavius, *De Incarn.* xiv. 2; that is, he speaks of a custom imperceptibly gaining a position, "*nullâ præceptorum vi, sed consensu quodam tacito tam populi quàm cleri, quasi tacitis omnium suffragiis recepta fuit, priusquàm ullo conciliorum decreto legimus eam fuisse firmatam.*" And then he adds, "This custom has its birth *in that people which is ruled by the Holy Ghost,*" &c.

4. Petavius speaks of a fourth aspect of it. "It is well said by St. Augustine, that to the minds of individuals certain things are revealed by God, not only by extraordinary means, as in visions, &c., but also in those usual ways, according to which what is unknown to them is opened *in answer to their prayer.* After this manner it is to be believed that God has revealed to Christians the sinless Conception of the Immaculate Virgin." *De Incarn.* xiv. 2, 11.

5. The fifth is enlarged upon in Dr. Newman's second *Lecture on Anglican Difficulties*, from which I quote a few lines: "We know that it is the property of life to be impatient of any foreign substance in the body to which it belongs. It will be sovereign in its own domain, and it conflicts with what it cannot assimilate into itself, and *is irritated and disordered* till it has expelled it. Such expulsion, then, is emphatically a test of uncongeniality, for it shows that the substance ejected, not only is not one with the body that rejects it, but cannot be made one with it; that its introduction is not only useless, or superfluous, or adventitious, but that it is intolerable." Presently he continues: "The religious life of a people is of a certain quality and direction, and these are tested by the mode in which it encounters the various opinions, customs, and institutions which are submitted to it. Drive a stake into a river's bed, and you will at once ascertain which way it is running, and at what speed; throw up even a straw upon the air, and you will see which way the wind blows; submit your heretical and Catholic principle to the action of the multitude, and you will be able to pronounce at once whether it is imbued with Catholic truth or with heretical

falsehood." And then he proceeds to exemplify this by a passage in the history of Arianism, the very history which I intend now to take, as illustrative of the truth and importance of the thesis on which I am insisting.

It is not a little remarkable, that, though, historically speaking, the fourth century is the age of doctors, illustrated, as it was, by the saints Athanasius, Hilary, the two Gregories, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, and all of these saints bishops also, except one, nevertheless in that very day the divine tradition committed to the infallible Church was proclaimed and maintained far more by the faithful than by the Episcopate.

Here, of course, I must explain:—in saying this, then, undoubtedly I am not denying that the great body of the Bishops were in their internal belief orthodox; nor that there were numbers of clergy who stood by the laity, and acted as their centres and guides; nor that the laity actually received their faith, in the first instance, from the Bishops and clergy; nor that some portions of the laity were ignorant, and other portions at length corrupted by the Arian teachers, who got possession of the sees and ordained an heretical clergy;—but I mean still, that in that time of immense confusion the divine dogma of our Lord's divinity was proclaimed, enforced, maintained, and (humanly speaking) preserved, far more by the "*Ecclesia docta*" than by the "*Ecclesia docens*;" that the body of the episcopate was unfaithful to its commission, while the body of the laity was faithful to its baptism; that at one time the Pope, at other times the patriarchal, metropolitan, and other great sees, at other times general councils, said what they should not have said, or did what obscured and compromised revealed truth; while, on the other hand, it was the Christian people who, under Providence, were the ecclesiastical strength of Athanasius, Hilary, Eusebius of Vercellæ, and other great solitary confessors, who would have failed without them.

I see, then, in the Arian history a palmary example of a state of the Church, during which, in order to know the tradition of the Apostles, we must have recourse to the faithful; for I fairly own, that if I go to writers, since I must adjust the letter of Justin, Clement, and Hippolytus with the Nicene Doctors, I get confused; and what revives and re-instates me, as far as history goes, is the faith of the people. For I argue that, unless they had been catechised, as St. Hilary says, in the orthodox faith from the time of their baptism, they never could have had that horror, which they show, of the heterodox Arian doctrine. Their voice, then, is the voice of tradition;

and the instance comes to us with still greater emphasis, when we consider—1. that it occurs in the very beginning of the history of the “*Ecclesia docens*,” for there can scarcely be said to be any history of her teaching till the age of martyrs was over; 2. that the doctrine in controversy was so momentous, being the very foundation of the Christian system; 3. that the state of controversy and disorder lasted over the long space of sixty years; and 4. that it involved serious persecutions, in life, limb, and property, to the faithful whose loyal perseverance decided it.

It seems, then, as striking an instance as I could take in fulfilment of Father Perrone’s statement, that the voice of tradition may in certain cases express itself, not by Councils, nor Fathers, nor Bishops, but the “*communis fidelium sensus*.”

I shall set down some authorities for the two points successively, which I have to enforce, viz. that the Nicene dogma was maintained during the greater part of the 4th century,

1. not by the unswerving firmness of the Holy See, Councils, or Bishops, but
2. by the “*consensus fidelium*.”

I. On the one hand, then, I say, that there was a temporary suspense of the functions of the “*Ecclesia docens*.” The body of Bishops failed in their confession of the faith. They spoke variously, one against another; there was nothing, after Nicæa, of firm, unvarying, consistent testimony, for nearly sixty years. There were untrustworthy Councils, unfaithful Bishops; there was weakness, fear of consequences, misguidance, delusion, hallucination, endless, hopeless, extending itself into nearly every corner of the Catholic Church. The comparatively few who remained faithful were discredited and driven into exile; the rest were either deceivers or were deceived.

1. A.D. 325. The great council of Nicæa, of 318 Bishops, chiefly from the eastern provinces of Christendom, under the presidency of Hosius of Cordova, as the Pope’s Legate. It was convoked against Arianism, which it once for all anathematized; and it inserted the formula of the “*Consubstantial*” into the Creed, with the view of establishing the fundamental dogma which Arianism impugned. It is the first Œcumenical Council, and recognised at the time its own authority as the voice of the infallible Church. It is so received by the *orbis terrarum* at this day. The history of the Arian controversy, from its date, A.D. 325, to the date of the second Œcumenical Council, A.D. 381, is the history of the struggle through Christendom for the universal acceptance or the repudiation of the formula of the “*Consubstantial*.”

2. A.D. 334, 335. The synods of Cæsarea and Tyre against Athanasius, who was therein accused and formally condemned of rebellion, sedition, and ecclesiastical tyranny ; of murder, sacrilege, and magic ; deposed from his see, forbidden to set foot in Alexandria for life, and banished to Gaul. Constantine confirmed the sentence.

3. A.D. 341. Council of Rome of fifty Bishops, attended by the exiles from Thrace, Syria, &c., by Athanasius, &c., in which Athanasius was pronounced innocent.

4. A.D. 341. Great Council of the Dedication at Antioch, attended by ninety or a hundred Bishops. The council ratified the proceedings of the councils of Cæsarea and Tyre, and placed an Arian in the see of Athanasius. Then it proceeded to pass a dogmatic decree in reversal of the formula of the "Consubstantial." Four or five creeds, instead of the Nicene, were successively adopted by the assembled fathers. The first was a creed which they ascribed to Lucian, a martyr and saint of the preceding century, in whom the Arians always gloried as their master. The second was fuller and stronger in its language, and made more pretension to orthodoxy. The third was more feeble again. These three creeds were circulated in the neighbourhood ; but, as they wished to send one to Rome, they directed a fourth to be drawn up. This, too, apparently failed. So little was known at the time of the real history of this synod and its creeds, that St. Hilary calls it "sanctorum synodus."

5. A.D. 345. Council of the creed called Macrostich. This creed suppresses, as did the third, the word "substance." The eastern Bishops sent this to the Bishops of the West, who rejected it.

6. A.D. 347. The great council of Sardica, attended by 380 Bishops. Before it commenced, the division between its members broke out on the question whether or not Athanasius should have a seat in it. In consequence, seventy-six retired to Philippopolis, on the Thracian side of Mount Hæmus, and there excommunicated the Pope and the Sardican fathers. These seceders published a sixth confession of faith. The synod of Sardica, including Bishops from Italy, Gaul, Africa, Egypt, Cyprus, and Palestine, confirmed the act of the Roman council, and restored Athanasius and the other exiles to their sees. The synod of Philippopolis, on the contrary, sent letters to the civil magistrates of those cities, forbidding them to admit the exiles into them. The imperial power took part with the Sardican fathers, and Athanasius went back to Alexandria.

7. A.D. 351. Before many years had run out, the great eastern party was up again. Under pretence of putting down a kind of Sabellianism, they drew up a new creed, into which they introduced certain inadvisable expressions of some of the ante-Nicene writers, on the subject of our Lord's divinity, and dropped the word "substance." St. Hilary thought this creed also Catholic ; and other Catholic writers style its fathers "holy Bishops."

8. There is considerable confusion of dates here. Anyhow, there

was a second Sirmian creed, in which the eastern party first came to a division among themselves. St. Hilary at length gives up these creeds as indefensible, and calls this one a "blasphemy." It is the first creed which criticises the words "substance," &c., as unscriptural. Some years afterwards this "blasphemia" seems to have been interpolated, and sent into the East in the name of Hosius. At a later date, there was a third Sirmian creed; and a second edition of it, with alterations, was published at Nice in Thrace.

9. A.D. 353. The council of Arles. I cannot find how many Bishops attended it. As the Pope sent several Bishops as legates, it must have been one of great importance. The Bishop of Arles was an Arian, and managed to seduce, or to force, a number of orthodox Bishops, including the Pope's legate, Vincent, to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius. Paulinus, Bishop of Trêves, was nearly the only champion of the Nicene faith and of Athanasius. He was accordingly banished into Phrygia, where he died.

10. A.D. 355. The council of Milan, of more than 300 Bishops of the West. Nearly all of them subscribed the condemnation of Athanasius; whether they generally subscribed the heretical creed, which was brought forward, does not appear. The Pope's four legates remained firm, and St. Dionysius of Milan, who died an exile in Asia Minor. An Arian was put into his see. Saturninus, the Bishop of Arles, proceeded to hold a council at Beziers; and its fathers banished St. Hilary to Phrygia.

11. A.D. 357. Hosius falls. "Constantius used such violence towards the old man, and confined him so straitly, that at last, broken by suffering, he was brought, though hardly, to hold communion with Valens and Ursacius [the Arian leaders], though he would not subscribe against Athanasius." *Athan. Arian. Hist.* 45.

12. Liberius. A.D. 357. "The tragedy was not ended in the lapse of Hosius, but in the evil which befell Liberius, the Roman Pontiff, it became far more dreadful and mournful, considering that he was Bishop of so great a city, and of the whole Catholic Church, and that he had so bravely resisted Constantine two years previously. There is nothing, whether in the historians and holy fathers, or in his own letters, to prevent our coming to the conclusion, that Liberius communicated with the Arians, and confirmed the sentence passed against Athanasius; but he is not at all on that account to be called a heretic." *Baron. Ann.* 357, 40-45. Athanasius says: "Liberius, after he had been in banishment two years, gave way, and from fear of threatened death was induced to subscribe." *Arian. Hist.* § 41. St. Jerome says: "Liberius, tædio victus exilii, in hæreticam pravitatem subscribens, Romam quasi victor intravit." *Chron.*

13. A.D. 359. The great councils of Seleucia and Ariminum, being one bi-partite council, representing the East and West respectively. At Seleucia there were 150 Bishops, of which only the twelve or thirteen from Egypt were champions of the Nicene "Consubstantial." At Ariminum there were as many as 400 Bishops, who, worn

out by the artifice of long delay on the part of the Arians, abandoned the "Consubstantial," and subscribed the ambiguous formula which the heretics had substituted for it.

14. A.D. 361. The death of Constantius ; the Catholic Bishops breathe again, and begin at once to remedy the miseries of the Church, though troubles were soon to break out anew.

15. A.D. 362. State of the Church of Antioch at this time. There were four Bishops or communions of Antioch ; first, the old succession and communion, which had possession before the Arian troubles ; secondly, the Arian succession, which had lately conformed to orthodoxy in the person of Meletius ; thirdly, the new Latin succession, lately created by Lucifer, whom some have thought the Pope's legate there ; and, fourthly, the new Arian succession, which was begun upon the recantation of Meletius. At length, as Arianism was brought under, the evil reduced itself to two successions, that of Meletius and the Latin, which went on for many years, the West and Egypt holding communion with the latter, and the East with the former.

16. A.D. 370-379. St. Basil was Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia through these years. The judgments formed about this great doctor in his lifetime show us vividly the extreme confusion which prevailed. He was accused by one party of being a follower of Apollinaris, and lost in consequence some of the sees over which he was metropolitan. He was accused by the monks in his friend Gregory's diocese of favouring the semi-Arians. He was accused by the Neocæsareans of inclining towards Arianism. And he was treated with suspicion and coldness by Pope Damasus.

17. About A.D. 360, St. Hilary says : "I am not speaking of things foreign to my knowledge ; I am not writing about what I am ignorant of ; I have heard and I have seen the shortcomings of persons who are present to me, not of laymen merely, but of Bishops. For, excepting the Bishop Eleusius and a few with him, for the most part the ten Asian provinces, within whose boundaries I am situate, are truly ignorant of God." It is observable, that even Eleusius, who is here spoken of as somewhat better than the rest, was a semi-Arian, according to Socrates, and even a persecutor of Catholics at Constantinople ; and, according to Sozomen, one of those who urged Pope Liberius to give up the Nicene formula of the "Consubstantial." By the ten Asian provinces is meant the east and south provinces of Asia Minor, pretty nearly as cut off by a line passing from Cyzicus to Seleucia through Synnada.

18. A.D. 360. St. Gregory Nazianzen says, about this date : "Surely the pastors have done foolishly ; for, excepting a very few, who, either on account of their insignificance were passed over, or who by reason of their virtue resisted, and who were to be left as a seed and root for the springing up again and revival of Israel by the influences of the Spirit, all temporised, only differing from each other in this, that some succumbed earlier, and others later ; some were foremost champions and leaders in the impiety, and others joined

the second rank of the battle, being overcome by fear, or by interest, or by flattery, or, what was the most excusable, by their own ignorance." *Orat.* xxi. 24.

19. A.D. 363. About this time, St. Jerome says : "Nearly all the churches in the whole world, under the pretence of peace and the emperor, are polluted with the communion of the Arians." *Chron.* Of the same date, that is, upon the council of Ariminum, are his famous words, "Ingemuit totus orbis et se esse Arianum miratus est." *In Lucif.* That is, the Catholics of Christendom were surprised indeed to find that their rulers had made Arians of them.

20. A.D. 364. And St. Hilary : "Up to this date, the only cause why Christ's people is not murdered by the priests of Antichrist, with this deceit of impiety, is, that they take the words, which the heretics use, to denote the faith which they themselves hold. Sanctiores aures plebis quàm corda sunt sacerdotum." *In Aux.* 6.

21. St. Hilary speaks of the series of ecclesiastical councils of that time in the following well-known passage : "It is most dangerous to us, and it is lamentable, that there are at present as many creeds as there are sentiments, and as many doctrines among us as dispositions, while we write creeds and explain them according to our fancy. Since the Nicene council, we have done nothing but write the creed. While we fight about words, inquire about novelties, take advantage of ambiguities, criticise authors, fight on party questions, have difficulties in agreeing, and prepare to anathematise each other, there is scarce a man who belongs to Christ. Take, for instance, last year's creed, what alteration is there not in it already ? First, we have the creed, which bids us not to use the Nicene 'consubstantial;' then comes another, which decrees and preaches it; next, the third, excuses the word 'substance,' as adopted by the fathers in their simplicity; lastly, the fourth, instead of excusing, condemns. We impose creeds by the year or by the month, we change our minds about our own imposition of them, then we prohibit our changes, then we anathematise our prohibitions. Thus, we either condemn others in our own persons, or ourselves in the instance of others, and while we bite and devour one another, are like to be consumed one of another."

22. A.D. 382. St. Gregory writes : "If I must speak the truth, I feel disposed to shun every conference of Bishops; for never saw I synod brought to a happy issue, and remedying, and not rather aggravating, existing evils. For rivalry and ambition are stronger than reason,—do not think me extravagant for saying so,—and a mediator is more likely to incur some imputation himself than to clear up the imputations which others lie under." *Ep.* 129. It must ever be kept in mind that a passage like this only relates, and is here quoted as only relating, to that miserable time of which it is spoken. Nothing more can be argued from it than that the "Ecclesia docens" is not at every time the active instrument of the Church's infallibility.

II. Now we come secondly to the proofs of the fidelity of the laity, and the effectiveness of that fidelity, during that domination of imperial heresy to which the foregoing passages have related. I have abridged the extracts which follow, but not, I hope, to the injury of their sense.

1. ALEXANDRIA. "We suppose," says Athanasius, "you are not ignorant what outrages they [the Arian Bishops] committed at Alexandria, for they are reported every where. They attacked *the holy virgins and brethren* with naked swords; they beat with scourges their persons, esteemed honourable in God's sight, so that their feet were lamed by the stripes, whose souls were whole and sound in purity and all good works." Athan. *Op. c. Arian.* 15, Oxf. tr.

"Accordingly Constantius writes letters, and commences *a persecution against all*. Gathering together a multitude of herdsmen and shepherds, and dissolute youths belonging to the town, armed with swords and clubs, they attacked in a body *the Church* of Quirinus: and *some* they slew, *some* they trampled under foot, *others* they beat with stripes and cast into prison or banished. They haled away many *women* also, and dragged them openly into the court, and insulted them, dragging them by the hair. *Some* they proscribed; from *some* they took away their bread, for no other reason but that they might be induced to join the Arians, and receive Gregory [the Arian Bishop], who had been sent by the Emperor." Athan. *Hist. Arian.* § 10.

"On the week that succeeded the holy Pentecost, when the *people*, after their fast, had gone out to the cemetery to pray, because that *all* refused communion with George [the Arian Bishop], the commander, Sebastian, straightway with a multitude of soldiers proceeded to *attack the people*, though it was the Lord's day; and finding a few praying, (for the greater part had already retired on account of the lateness of the hour,) having lighted a pile, he placed certain *virgins* near the fire, and endeavoured to force them to say that they were of the Arian faith. And having seized on *forty men*, he cut some fresh twigs of the palm-tree, with the thorns upon them, and scourged them on the back so severely that some of them were for a long time under medical treatment, on account of the thorns which had entered their flesh, and others, unable to bear up under their sufferings, died. All those whom they had taken, both the men and the virgins, they sent away into banishment to the great oasis. Moreover, they immediately banished out of Egypt and Libya the following Bishops [sixteen], and the presbyters, Hierax and Dioscorus: some of them died on the way, others in the place of their banishment. They caused also more than thirty Bishops to take to flight." *Apol. de Fug.* 7.

2. EGYPT. "The Emperor Valens having issued an edict commanding that the orthodox should be expelled both from Alexandria and the rest of Egypt, *depopulation and ruin to an immense extent immediately followed*; some were dragged before the tribunals,

others cast into prison, and many tortured in various ways ; all sorts of punishment being inflicted upon persons who aimed only at peace and quiet." Socr. *Hist.* iv. 24, Bohn.

3. THE MONKS OF EGYPT. "*Antony left the solitude of the desert to go about every part of the city [Alexandria], warning the inhabitants that the Arians were opposing the truth, and that the doctrines of the Apostles were preached only by Athanasius.*" Theod. *Hist.* iv. 27, Bohn.

"Lucius, the Arian, with a considerable body of troops, proceeded to the *monasteries* of Egypt, where he in person assailed the assemblage of holy men with greater fury than the ruthless soldiery. When these excellent persons remained unmoved by all the violence, in despair he advised the military chief to send the fathers of the monks, the Egyptian Macarius and his namesake of Alexandria, into exile." Socr. iv. 24.

OF CONSTANTINOPLE. "*Isaac, on seeing the emperor depart at the head of his army, exclaimed, 'You who have declared war against God cannot gain His aid. Cease from fighting against Him, and He will terminate the war. Restore the pastors to their flocks, and then you will obtain a bloodless victory.'*" *Ibid.* 34.

OF SYRIA, &c. "That these heretical doctrines [Apollinarian and Eunomian] did not finally become predominant is *mainly to be attributed to the zeal of the monks* of this period ; for *all the monks* of Syria, Cappadocia, and the neighbouring provinces *were sincerely attached to the Nicene faith.* The same fate awaited them which had been experienced by the Arians ; for they incurred the full weight of the popular odium and aversion, when it was observed that their sentiments were regarded with suspicion by the monks." Sozom. *Hist.* vii. 27, Bohn.

OF CAPPADOCIA. "Gregory, the father of Gregory Theologus, otherwise a most excellent man and a zealous defender of the true and Catholic religion, not being on his guard against the artifices of the Arians, such was his simplicity, received with kindness certain men who were contaminated with the poison, and subscribed an impious proposition of theirs. This moved the monks to such indignation, that they *withdrew forthwith from his communion*, and took with them, after their example, a *considerable part of his flock.*" Ed. Bened. *Monit. in Greg. Naz. Orat.* 6.

4. SYRIA. "Syria and the neighbouring provinces were plunged into confusion and disorder, for the Arians were very numerous in these parts, and had possession of the churches. The members of the Catholic Church *were not, however, few in numbers.* It was through their instrumentality that the Church of Antioch was preserved from the encroachments of the Arians, and enabled to resist the power of Valens. Indeed, it appears that all the Churches which were governed by men who were firmly attached to the faith did not deviate from the form of doctrine which they had originally embraced." Sozom. vi. 21.

5. ANTIOCH. "Whereas he (the Bishop Leontius) took part in

the blasphemy of Arius, he made a point of concealing this disease, partly *for fear of the multitude*, partly for the menaces of Constantius; so those who followed the apostolical dogmas gained from him neither patronage nor ordination, but those who held Arianism were allowed the fullest liberty of speech, and were placed in the ranks of the sacred ministry. But Flavian and Diodorus, who had embraced the ascetical life, and maintained the apostolical dogmas, *openly withstood* Leontius's machinations against religious doctrine. They threatened that they would retire from the communion of his Church, and would go to the West, and reveal his intrigues. Though they were not as yet in the sacred ministry, but were *in the ranks of the laity*, night and day they used to excite all the people to zeal for religion. They were the first to divide the singers into two choirs, and to teach them to sing alternately the strains of David. They too, assembling the devout at the shrines of the martyrs, passed the whole night there in hymns to God. These things Leontius seeing, did not think it safe to hinder them, for he saw that *the multitude was especially well affected* towards those excellent persons. Nothing, however, could persuade Leontius to correct his wickedness. It follows, that among the clergy were many who were infected with the heresy: but *the mass of the people were champions of orthodoxy.*" Theodor. *Hist.* ii. 24.

6. EDESSA. "There is in that city a magnificent church, dedicated to St. Thomas the Apostle, wherein, on account of the sanctity of the place, religious assemblies are continually held. The Emperor Valens wished to inspect this edifice; when, having learned that *all who usually congregated there were opposed to the heresy* which he favoured, he is said to have struck the prefect with his own hand, because he had neglected to expel them thence. The prefect, to prevent the slaughter of *so great a number* of persons, privately warned them against resorting thither. But his admonitions and menaces were alike unheeded; for on the following day *they all crowded to the church.* When the prefect was going towards it with a large military force, a poor woman, leading her own little child by the hand, hurried hastily by on her way to the church, breaking through the ranks of the soldiery. The prefect, irritated at this, ordered her to be brought to him, and thus addressed her: 'Wretched woman, whither are you running in so disorderly a manner?' She replied, 'To the same place that others are hastening.' 'Have you not heard,' said he, 'that the prefect is about to put to death all that shall be found there?' 'Yes,' said the woman, 'and therefore I hasten, that I may be found there.' 'And whither are you dragging that little child?' said the prefect. The woman answered, '*That he also may be vouchsafed the honour of martyrdom.*' The prefect went back and informed the emperor that *all were ready to die in behalf of their own faith*; and added that it would be preposterous to destroy so many persons at one time, and thus succeeded in restraining the emperor's wrath." Socr. iv. 18. "Thus was the Christian faith confessed by the *whole city* of Edessa." Sozom. vi. 18.

7. SAMOSATA. "The Arians, having deprived this exemplary flock of their shepherd, elected in his place an individual with whom *none of the inhabitants of the city*, whether poor or rich, servants or mechanics, husbandmen or gardeners, men or women, young or old, would hold communion. *He was left quite alone*; no one even calling to see him, or exchanging a word with him. It is, however, said that his disposition was extremely gentle; and this is proved by what I am about to relate. One day, when he went to bathe in the public baths, the attendants closed the doors; but he ordered the doors to be thrown open, that the people might be admitted to bathe with himself. Perceiving that they remained in a standing posture before him, imagining that great deference towards himself was the cause of this conduct, he arose and left the bath. *These people believed that the water had been contaminated by his heresy*, and ordered it to be let out and fresh water to be supplied. When he heard of this circumstance, he left the city, thinking that he ought no longer to remain in a place *where he was the object of public aversion and hatred*. Upon this retirement of Eunonius, Lucius was elected as his successor by the Arians. Some young persons were amusing themselves with playing at ball in the market-place; Lucius was passing by at the time, and the ball happened to fall beneath the feet of the ass on which he was mounted. *The youths uttered loud exclamations, believing that the ball was contaminated*. They lighted a fire, and hurled the ball through it, believing that by this process the ball would be purified. Although this was only a childish deed, and although it exhibits the remains of ancient superstition, yet *it is sufficient to show the odium which the Arian faction had incurred in this city*. Lucius was far from imitating the mildness of Eunonius, and he persuaded the heads of government to exile most of the clergy." Theodor. iv. 15.

8. OSROENE. "Arianism met with similar opposition at the same period in Osroëne and Cappadocia. Basil Bishop of Cæsarea, and Gregory Bishop of Nazianzus, were held in high admiration and esteem *throughout these regions*." Sozom. vi. 21.

9. CAPPADOCIA. "Valens, in passing through Cappadocia, did all in his power to injure the orthodox, and to deliver up the churches to the Arians. He thought to accomplish his designs more easily on account of a dispute which was then pending between Basil and Eusebius, who governed the Church of Cæsarea. This dissension had been the cause of Basil's departing to Pontus. *The people, and some of the most powerful and wisest men of the city*, began to regard Eusebius with suspicion, and to meditate a secession from his communion. The emperor and the Arian Bishops regarded the absence of Basil, and the hatred of the people towards Eusebius, as circumstances that would tend greatly to the success of their designs. *But their expectations were utterly frustrated*. On the first intelligence of the intention of the emperor to pass through Cappadocia, Basil returned to Cæsarea, where he effected a reconciliation with Euse-

bis. The projects of Valens were thus defeated, and he returned with his Bishops." Sozom. vi. 19.

10. PONTUS. "It is said that when Eulalius, Bishop of Amasia in Pontus, returned from exile, he found that his Church had passed into the hands of an Arian, and that *scarcely fifty inhabitants of the city* had submitted to the control of their new Bishop." Sozom. vii. 2.

11. ARMENIA. "That company of Arians who came with Eustathius to Nicopolis had promised that they would bring over this city to compliance with the commands of the imperial vicar. This city had great ecclesiastical importance, both because it was the metropolis of Armenia, and because it had been ennobled by the blood of martyrs, and governed hitherto by Bishops of great reputation, and thus, as Basil calls it, was the nurse of religion and the metropolis of sound doctrine. Fronto, one of the city presbyters, who had hitherto shown himself as a champion of the truth, through ambition gave himself up to the enemies of Christ, and purchased the bishopric of the Arians at the price of renouncing the Catholic faith. This wicked proceeding of Eustathius and the Arians brought a new glory instead of evil to the Nicopolitans, since it gave them an opportunity of defending the faith. Fronto, indeed, the Arians consecrated, *but there was a remarkable unanimity of clergy and people in rejecting him*. Scarcely one or two clerks sided with him; on the contrary, he *became the execration of all Armenia*." *Vita S. Basil. Maurin.* pp. clvii. clviii.

12. NICOMEDIA. "Eighty pious clergy proceeded to Nicomedia, and there presented to the emperor a supplicatory petition complaining of the ill-usage to which they had been subjected. Valens, dissembling his displeasure in their presence, gave Modestus, the prefect, a secret order to apprehend these persons and put them to death. The prefect, *fearing that he should excite the populace to a seditious movement* against himself, if he attempted the public execution of so many, pretended to send them away into exile," &c. Soer. iv. 16.

13. ASIA MINOR. St. Basil says, about the year 372: "Religious people keep silence, but every blaspheming tongue is let loose. Sacred things are profaned; *those of the laity* who are sound in faith *avoid the places of worship* as schools of impiety, and raise their hands in solitude, with groans and tears, to the Lord in heaven." *Ep.* 93. Four years after he writes: "Matters have come to this pass; *the people have left their houses of prayer*, and assemble in deserts: a pitiable sight; *women and children, old men, and others infirm*, wretchedly faring in the open air, amid the most profuse rains and snow-storms, and winds, and frost of winter; and again in summer under a scorching sun. To this they submit, because they *will have no part in the wicked Arian leaven*." *Ep.* 342. Again: "Only one offence is now vigorously punished, an accurate observance of our fathers' traditions. For this cause the pious are driven from their countries, and transported into deserts. The

people are in lamentation, in continual tears at home and abroad. There is a cry in the city, a cry in the country, in the roads, in the deserts. Joy and spiritual cheerfulness are no more; our feasts are turned into mourning; our houses of prayer are shut up, our altars deprived of the spiritual worship." Ep. 343.

14. SCYTHIA. "There are in this country a great number of cities, of towns, and of fortresses. According to an ancient custom which still prevails, all the churches of the whole country are under the sway of one Bishop. Valens [the emperor] repaired to the church, and strove to gain over the Bishop to the heresy of Arius; but this latter manfully opposed his arguments, and, after a courageous defence of the Nicene doctrines, quitted the emperor, and proceeded to another church, *whither he was followed by the people. Valens was extremely offended at being left alone in a church with his attendants, and, in resentment, condemned Vetrano [the Bishop] to banishment. Not long after, however, he recalled him, because, I believe, he apprehended an insurrection."* Sozom. vi. 21.

15. CONSTANTINOPLE. "Those who acknowledged the doctrine of consubstantiality were not only expelled from the churches, but also from the cities. But although expulsion at first satisfied them [the Arians], they soon proceeded to the worse extremity of inducing compulsory communion with them, caring little for such a desecration of the churches. They resorted to all kinds of scourgings, a variety of tortures, and confiscation of property. Many were punished with exile, some died under the torture, and others were put to death while being driven from their country. *These atrocities were exercised throughout all the eastern cities, but especially at Constantinople."* Socr. ii. 27.

The following passage is quoted for the substantial fact which it contains, viz. the testimony of popular tradition to the Catholic doctrine: "At this period a union was nearly effected between the Novatian and Catholic Churches; for, as they both *held the same sentiments concerning the Divinity*, and were subjected to a common persecution, the members of both Churches assembled and prayed together. The Catholics then possessed no houses of prayer, for the Arians had wrested them from them." Sozom. iv. 20.

16. ILLYRIA. "The parents of Theodosius were Christians, and were attached to the Nicene doctrine, hence he took pleasure in the ministration of Ascholius [Bishop of Thessalonica]. He also rejoiced at finding that the *Arian heresy had not been received in Illyria."* Sozom. vii. 4.

17. NEIGHBOURHOOD OF MACEDONIA. "Theodosius inquired concerning the religious sentiments which were prevalent in the other provinces, and ascertained that, as far as Macedonia, *one form of belief was universally predominant,*" &c. Ibid.

18. ROME. "With respect to doctrine no dissension arose either at Rome or in any other of the Western Churches. *The people unanimously adhered to the form of belief established at Nicæa."* Sozom. vi. 23.

“Not long after, Liberius (the Pope) was recalled and re-instated in his see; for the people of Rome, *having raised a sedition, and expelled Felix* [whom the Arian party had intruded] from their Church, Constantius deemed it *inexpedient to provoke the popular fury.*” Socr. ii. 37.

“Liberius, returning to Rome, found the *mind of the mass of men alienated from him*, because he had so shamefully yielded to Constantius. And thus it came to pass, that those persons who had hitherto kept aloof from Felix [the rival Pope], and had avoided his communion in favour of Liberius, on hearing what had happened, *left him for Felix*, who raised the Catholic standard. Among others, Damasus [afterwards Pope] took the side of Felix. Such had been, even from the times of the Apostles, *the love of Catholic discipline in the Roman people.*” Baron. ann. 357. He tells us besides, that the people would not even go to the public baths, lest they should bathe with the party of Liberius.

19. MILAN. “At the council of Milan, Eusebius of Vercellæ, when it was proposed to draw up a declaration against Athanasius, said that the council ought first to be sure of the faith of the Bishops attending it, for he had found out that some of them were polluted with heresy. Accordingly he brought before the Fathers the Nicene creed, and said he was willing to comply with all their demands, after they had subscribed that confession. Dionysius, Bishop of Milan, at once took up the paper and began to write his assent; but Valens [the Arian] violently pulled pen and paper out of his hands, crying out that such a course of proceeding was impossible. Whereupon, after much tumult, *the question came before the people, and great was the distress of all of them*; the faith of the Church was impugned by the Bishops. *They then, dreading the judgment of the people*, transfer their meeting from the church to the imperial palace.” Hilar. in Const. i.

“As the feast of Easter approached, the empress sent to St. Ambrose to ask a church of him, where the Arians who attended her might meet together. He replied, that a Bishop could not give up the temple of God. The pretorian prefect came into the church, where St. Ambrose was, *attended by the people*, and endeavoured to persuade him to yield up at least the Portian Basilica. *The people were clamorous against the proposal*; and the prefect retired to report how matters stood to the emperor. The Sunday following, St. Ambrose was explaining the creed, when he was informed that the officers were hanging up the imperial hangings in the Portian Basilica, and that upon this news the people were repairing thither. While he was offering up the holy sacrifice, a second message came that *the people had seized an Arian priest* as he was passing through the street. He despatched a number of his clergy to the spot to *rescue the Arian from his danger.* The court looked on this resistance of the people as seditious, and immediately laid considerable fines upon *the whole body of the tradesmen* of the city. Several were thrown into prison. In three days’ time these tradesmen were fined

two hundred pounds weight of gold, and they said *that they were ready to give as much again, on condition that they might retain their faith.* The prisons were filled with tradesmen : *all the officers of the household, secretaries, agents of the emperor, and dependent officers who served under various counts, were kept within doors, and were forbidden to appear in public under pretence that they should bear no part in the sedition. Men of higher rank were menaced with severe consequences, unless the Basilica were surrendered.* . . .

"Next morning the Basilica was surrounded by soldiers ; but it was reported, that *these soldiers had sent to the emperor to tell him that if he wished to come abroad he might, and that they would attend him, if he was going to the assembly of the Catholics ; otherwise, that they would go to that which would be held by St. Ambrose.* Indeed, the *soldiers were all Catholics, as well as the citizens of Milan ; there were no heretics there, except a few officers of the emperor and some Goths.* . . .

"St. Ambrose was continuing his discourse when he was told that the emperor had withdrawn the soldiers from the Basilica, and that he had restored to the tradesmen the fines which he had exacted from them. *This news gave joy to the people, who expressed their delight with applauses and thanksgivings ; the soldiers themselves were eager to bring the news, throwing themselves on the altars, and kissing them in token of peace.*" Fleury's *Hist.* xviii. 41, 42, Oxf. trans.

20. THE SOLDIERY. Soldiers having been mentioned in the foregoing extract, I add the following passage. "Terentius, a general distinguished by his valour and by his piety, was able, on his return from Armenia, to erect trophies of victory. Valens promised to give him every thing that he might desire. But he asked not for gold or silver, for lands, power, or honours ; *he requested that a church might be given to those who preached the apostolical doctrines.*" Theodor. iv. 32.

"Valens sent Trajan, the general, against the barbarians. Trajan was defeated, and, on his return, the emperor reproached him severely, and accused him of weakness and cowardice. But Trajan replied with great boldness, 'It is not I, O emperor, who have been defeated ; for you, *by fighting against God, have thrown the barbarians upon His protection.* Do you not know who those are whom you have driven from the churches, and who are those to whom you have given them up ?' Arintheus and Victor, the other commanders, *accorded in what he had said,* and brought the emperor to reflect on the truth of their remonstrances." Ibid. 33.

21. CHRISTENDOM GENERALLY. St. Hilary to Constantius : "Not only in words, but in tears, we beseech you to save the Catholic Churches from any longer continuance of these most grievous injuries, and of their present intolerable persecutions and insults, which moreover they are enduring, which is monstrous, from our brethren. Surely your clemency should listen to the *voice of those who cry out so loudly, 'I am a Catholic, I have no wish to be a heretic.'* It

should seem equitable to your sanctity, most glorious Augustus, that they who fear the Lord God and His judgment should not be polluted and contaminated with execrable blasphemies, but *should have liberty to follow those Bishops and prelates* who observe inviolate the laws of charity, and who desire a perpetual and sincere peace. It is impossible, it is unreasonable, to mix true and false, to confuse light and darkness, and bring into a union, of whatever kind, night and day. *Give permission to the populations to hear the teaching of the pastors whom they have wished*, whom they fixed on, whom they have chosen, to attend their celebration of the divine mysteries, to offer prayers through them for your safety and prosperity." *In Const. i.*

Now I know quite well what will be said to so elaborate a collection of instances as I have been making. The "lector benevolus" will quote against me the words of Cicero, "Utitur in re non dubiâ testibus non necessariis." This is sure to befall a man when he directs the attention of a friend to any truth which hitherto he has thought little of. At first, he seems to be hazarding a paradox, and at length to be committing a truism. The hearer is first of all startled, and then disappointed; he ends by asking, "Is this all?" It is a curious phenomenon in the philosophy of the human mind, that we often do not know whether we hold a point or not, though we hold it; but when our attention is once drawn to it, then forthwith we find it so much part of ourselves, that we cannot recollect when we began to hold it, and we conclude (with truth), and we declare, that it has always been our belief. Now it strikes me as worth noticing, that, though Father Perrone is so clear upon the point of doctrine which I have been urging in 1847, yet in 1842, which is the date of my own copy of his *Prælectiones*, he has not given the *consensus fidelium* any distinct place in his *Loci Theologici*, though he has even given "heretici" a place there. Among the *Media Traditionis*, he enumerates the *magisterium* of the Church, the Acts of the Martyrs, the Liturgy, usages and rites of worship, the Fathers, heretics, Church history; but not a word, that I can find, directly and separately, about the *sensus fidelium*. This is the more remarkable, because, speaking of the *Acta Martyrum*, he gives a reason for the force of the testimony of the martyrs which belongs quite as fully to the faithful generally; viz. that, as not being theologians, they can only repeat that objective truth, which, on the other hand, Fathers and theologians do but present subjectively, and thereby coloured with their own mental peculiarities. "We learn from them," he says, "what was the traditional doctrine in both domestic and public assemblies of

the Church, without any admixture of private and (so to say) subjective explanation, such as at times creates a difficulty in ascertaining the real meaning of the Fathers; and so much the more, because many of them were either women or ordinary and untaught laymen, who brought out and avowed just what they believed in a straightforward inartificial way." May we not conjecture that the argument from the Consent of the Faithful was but dimly written among the *Loci* on the tablets of his intellect, till the necessities, or rather the requirements, of the contemplated definition of the Immaculate Conception brought the argument before him with great force? Yet who will therefore for an instant suppose that he did not always hold it? Perhaps I have overlooked some passage of his treatises, and am in consequence interpreting his course of thought wrongly; but, at any rate, what I seem to see in him, is what actually does occur from time to time in myself and others. A man holds an opinion or a truth, yet without holding it with a simple consciousness and a direct recognition; and thus, though he has never denied, he has never gone so far as to profess it.

As to the particular doctrine to which I have here been directing my view, and the passage in history by which I have been illustrating it, I am not supposing that such times as the Arian will ever come again. As to the present, certainly, if there ever was an age which might dispense with the testimony of the faithful, and leave the maintenance of the truth to the pastors of the Church, it is the age in which we live. Never was the Episcopate of Christendom so devoted to the Holy See, so religious, so earnest in the discharge of its special duties, so little disposed to innovate, so superior to the temptation of theological sophistry. And perhaps this is the reason why the "consensus fidelium" has, in the minds of many, fallen into the background. Yet each constituent portion of the Church has its proper functions, and no portion can safely be neglected. Though the laity be but the reflection or echo of the clergy in matters of faith, yet there is something in the "*pastorum et fidelium conspiratio*," which is not in the pastors alone. The history of the definition of the Immaculate Conception shows us this; and it will be one among the blessings which the Holy Mother, who is the subject of it, will gain for us, in repayment of the definition, that by that very definition we are all reminded of the part which the laity have had in the preliminaries of its promulgation. Pope Pius has given us a pattern, in his manner of defining, of the duty of considering the sentiments of the laity upon a point of tradition, in spite of what-

ever fullness of evidence the Bishops had already thrown upon it.

In most cases when a definition is contemplated, the laity will have a testimony to give; but if ever there be an instance when they ought to be consulted, it is in the case of doctrines which bear directly upon devotional sentiments. Such is the Immaculate Conception, of which the *Rambler* was speaking in the sentence which has occasioned these remarks. The faithful people have ever a special function in regard to those doctrinal truths which relate to the Objects of worship. Hence it is, that, while the Councils of the fourth century were traitors to our Lord's divinity, the laity vehemently protested against its impugnors. Hence it is, that, in a later age, when the learned Benedictines of Germany and France were perplexed in their enunciation of the doctrine of the Real Presence, Paschasius was supported by the faithful in his maintenance of it. The saints, again, are the object of a religious *cultus*; and therefore it was the faithful, again, who urged on the Holy See, in the time of John XXII., to declare their beatitude in heaven, though so many Fathers spoke variously. And the Blessed Virgin is preëminently an object of devotion; and therefore it is, I repeat, that though Bishops had already spoken in favour of her absolute sinlessness, the Pope was not content without knowing the feelings of the faithful.

Father Dalgairns gives us another case in point; and with his words I conclude: "While devotion in the shape of a dogma issues from the high places of the Church, in the shape of devotion . . . it starts from below. . . Place yourselves, in imagination, in a vast city of the East in the fifth century. Ephesus, the capital of Asia Minor, is all in commotion; for a council is to be held there, and Bishops are flocking in from all parts of the world. There is anxiety painted on every face; so that you may easily see that the question is one of general interest. . . . Ask the very children in the streets what is the matter; they will tell you that wicked men are coming to make out that their own mother is not the Mother of God. And so, during a live-long day of June, they crowd around the gates of the old cathedral-church of St. Mary, and watch with anxious faces each Bishop as he goes in. Well might they be anxious; for it is well known that Nestorius has won the court over to his side. It was only the other day that he entered the town, with banners displayed and trumpets sounding, surrounded by the glittering files of the emperor's body-guard, with Count Candidianus, their general and his own partisan, at

their head. Besides which, it is known for certain, that at least eighty-four Bishops are ready to vote with him; and who knows how many more? He is himself the patriarch of Constantinople, the rival of Rome, the imperial city of the East; and then John of Antioch is hourly expected with his quota of votes; and he, the patriarch of the see next in influence to that of Nestorius, is, if not a heretic, at least of that wretched party which, in ecclesiastical disputes, ever hovers between the two camps of the devil and of God. The day wears on, and still nothing issues from the church; it proves, at least, that there is a difference of opinion; and as the shades of evening close around them, the weary watchers grow more anxious still. At length the great gates of the Basilica are thrown open; and oh, what a cry of joy bursts from the assembled crowd, as it is announced to them that Mary has been proclaimed to be, what every one with a Catholic heart knew that she was before, the Mother of God! . . . Men, women, and children, the noble and the low-born, the stately matron and the modest maiden, all crowd round the Bishops with acclamations. They will not leave them; they accompany them to their homes with a long procession of lighted torches; they burn incense before them, after the eastern fashion, to do them honour. There was but little sleep in Ephesus that night; for very joy they remained awake: the whole town was one blaze of light, for each window was illuminated.”*

My own drift is somewhat different from that which has dictated this glowing description; but the substance of the argument of each of us is one and the same. I think certainly that the *Ecclesia docens* is more happy when she has such enthusiastic partisans about her as are here represented, than when she cuts off the faithful from the study of her divine doctrines and the sympathy of her divine contemplations, and requires from them a *fides implicita* in her word, which in the educated classes will terminate in indifference, and in the poorer in superstition.

O.

* Sacred Heart.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

IS TEMPORAL PROSPERITY A NOTE OF THE CHURCH?

SIR,—I speak under correction, but I think not. My space only permits me to give some rapid indication of what may be said on so large a subject.

Luther asserted adversity to be a note of the Church, and Bellarmine's reply to this will hold good also against the opposite extreme. Facts are against it.* "The Church," he says, "at the commencement, as well as latterly, suffered great straits, and her middle ages were most prosperous. And," he adds, "all these things were foretold." It is true Bellarmine points† to the "temporal prosperity granted by God to those who have defended the Church;" but I think this must rather be understood as an extraordinary sign of the truth than as its necessary accompaniment. Certainly, in the heading to his explanation of the 127th Psalm, he tells us that St. Hilary and St. Augustine consider its promises of temporal prosperity as so peculiar to the old dispensation that they are compelled to give it a mystical interpretation in order to adapt it to Christian times; and he elsewhere‡ bids Christians fear prosperity as the husbandman fears unseasonable mildness. In the days of old, the book of Job gave a mysterious warning that temporal prosperity was to be no note of the Church; and most certainly the motto of Christianity, "Seek the things that are above, not the things that are upon the earth," does not naturally tend to making money, or rising in society.

To say, "Religion may preach poverty to the saint, but it teaches worldly success and the comforts of life to the faithful at large," appears to me inaccurate and exaggerated language, though there is a certain truth which it misrepresents. God's blessing will assuredly accompany the practice of His true religion; but whether that blessing will bring with it worldly success, depends on what God's wisdom sees best in each particular case. The Church must not frighten away the weak in faith, who half dread to look to heaven lest it should cost them earth; and she bids them "Seek first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you." If temporal prosperity is good for you, you will have it. But this is not *to teach* these things. In the catacombs of old, the faithful recognised the Cross where catechumens saw only the picture of an anchor; and when the Cross took possession of the Basilicas its

* De notis Eccl. iv. 2.

† Ibid. iv. 18.

‡ Concio iii. Dom. prima Adv.

shame was veiled from the multitude by the rich jewels which studded it ; yet then, as now, the Church preached the Cross ; and now, as then, she teaches *Væ divites ! Beati pauperes !*

I do not see any real difficulty in the Protestant argument which O. H. cannot answer. It is as old as the days of St. Gregory the Great, who tells us,* that heretics are so intent on present things that they do not recognise the Church *in vulneribus positam*. It is quite true that religion cultivates natural virtues whose natural fruit may be temporal prosperity, *but she does so for another end*, she aims at heaven, and leaves earth to take its chance. God may often leave His elect without their natural reward, in order to give them a hundred-fold more in a supernatural way ; but His justice will not allow others to lose the reward of virtue, even though practised apart from the love of Him, in a natural way ; which may deserve earth, though it cannot merit heaven. So we need not be surprised that Protestant often excel Catholic countries in temporal prosperity. When (as in England) a Protestant people is blessed with great natural virtues and gifts, it is no wonder that God gives them the worldly success they strive after ; He gives them pleasant homes, full purses, a good name, and national greatness ; and they hug themselves with satisfaction, and talk of their honest pride, and how moral they are, "not as this publican !" and they exclaim, "Who is lord over us ?" and mock at the idea of returning to be the servants of an Italian Bishop, whose country swarms with beggars !

Italy has never, in Christian times, attained the worldly greatness of Protestant England, or heathen Rome ; nor can she be said to have decayed like Greece or Egypt. In her brightest days she could only boast of several great and independent merchant cities, who tore her bosom with their mutual wars and jealousies, and were themselves distracted by internal dissensions, or oppressed by tyrants. Their commerce passed away through a natural cause, when the high road to the East took another direction. She was hardly ever free from actual or attempted foreign domination. I know nothing to prove that the character of the different peoples she comprises has deteriorated, *excepting through the fearful spread of revolutionary and infidel principles* ; which was as bad in France. Germany as well as Italy was the cradle of modern arts and sciences, and in Italy as well as Germany they reign to this day. I doubt if, at this moment, England can boast of higher intellectual gifts (though she brings them more into play) than Italy, or if Lyons can surpass the Roman silk in its way. The Church preserved and christianised what heathen intellect had produced and debased, that she might use it as a means in her task of bringing man to his perfection. But the arts and sciences are only an accidental accompaniment of her divine mission ; when the world despised them, she was their foster parent ; and now the silly world makes them an end of its existence, she is accused of neglecting them ! If the Italians were better

* Moral. iii. 24.

children of the Church, certainly their political troubles would not be what they are ; but this does not prove any particular government to be in fault, much less the Church, so far as Austria is concerned. For, till yesterday, Austrian policy was notoriously oppressive to her. All honour to the young Emperor for the new Concordat, of which the Sardinian government complains so feelingly to England ! but its fruits are yet to come. However, in Rome, if any where, there is a Catholic government ; but is it responsible for the natural character of its people ? and where a people take part in the administration of a government, they will impart more or less of their own character to it. But an unsettled people is no more *proof* of a bad government than an unruly son is proof of a bad father. A divine government did not cure the Jews. St. Bernard described the Roman character in no cheering colours to Pope Eugenius, but he bade him not lose heart :* “ You have to answer for its *care*, not its *cure* ; ” “ Non est in medico semper relevetur ut æger.”

The temporal power of the Popes is marked with the Cross throughout. Its very virtues are said to hinder its temporal success. The April *Edinburgh Review* (p. 588) says, “ The most fruitful sources of evil and corruption amongst the Roman population are the boundless charitable endowments which pauperise the city.” Well, almsgiving is a truer note of the Church than temporal prosperity. It is no new thing for the people of Italy to be so blind to the treasure they possess, to shut their eyes to their true glory in being the seat of the Papacy, and to yearn after a king like other nations ; to look back to Egypt, to the days of pagan greatness. Cesare Balbo says, “ The imitation of ancient Rome, the puerile and senseless desire to resuscitate its power, has contributed more than any thing, perhaps, to lead astray Italian minds, from the tenth century down to the present day.” And we all know that when Pius IX. sought refuge on the shores of Naples, he found there the tomb of a sainted predecessor,† whose dying words, 763 years before, had been, “ I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile ; ” but who lived not to hear his attendant Bishop’s answer, “ Holy Father, you cannot die in exile, for the good pleasure of God has given you the peoples for your inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for the limits of your jurisdiction.” The Church’s government must not be tested by Italy alone ; Rome is but the centre of her world-wide sway and influence ; and is it not fitting that at every step Rome should remind us her kingdom is not of this world ? Who can look out from those walls over the wide Campagna, strewn with the huge ruins of her pagan predecessor, without hearing the angel’s cry ringing in his soul, “ Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen ! ” and without feeling in his inmost being how the new Jerusalem has descended on the earth, to sanctify to that scene of desolation the penance which the very ground seems to be undergoing for its former pride ; and he sees far off the type of peace in the white

* De Consid. iv. 2.

† St. Greg. VII.

gleaming walls of the Passionist convent, modestly reposing where once rose the heathen temple of the Latin Jove. And when, from this grand and peaceful scene of penitent desolation he turns to the silent city, the cross is there again to greet him ; and his heart tells him that, in the very nature of things, Christian Rome was never meant to have its place in the world by the side of glittering Paris or bustling London. In Rome the very air is redolent of grace ; and if the Italians will persist in making light of their blessings, it is no wonder they fall like Lucifer. Theirs is an atmosphere of supernatural life, for good or for evil ; it engenders heroic virtues and glorious saints : and Satan has his side of the picture ; he finds easy entrance into sacrilegious souls, and can wield through them unusual power. Moreover, he finds his work done well enough in many places without disturbing existing governments ; and Freemasonry does much for him very quietly every where, so he does not trouble himself about other secret societies except in Catholic countries, where he cannot leave things quiet ; and especially in Italy will he exert all his malice against her who is clothed with the sun, and has the moon of temporal changes under her feet ; against the glorious Church of God, and her earthly head the venerable Vicar of Christ. And, above all, will he rage and gnash his teeth against our present illustrious and beloved Pontiff, chosen by God to proclaim to the world the Immaculate Conception of our Lord's blessed Mother, by whose means the vile serpent's head is crushed, and all his efforts rendered futile.

And, as Bellarmine says, *omnia prædicta sunt*. Our Lord did not promise us temporal prosperity ; He said, "In the world you shall have distress ; but have confidence, I have overcome the world."

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

M. S.

Feast of our Lady, Help of Christians, 1859.

TEMPORAL PROSPERITY, WHETHER A NOTE OF THE CHURCH.

SIR,—I cannot resist writing a few lines upon the letter signed O. H. in your last Number.

With much in it I agree ; but O. H.'s argument overlooks altogether the greatest illustration the world has ever seen of an exclusively national Church,—I mean the chosen people of God in the Old Testament. We see there a people who were, with few exceptions, the sole depositaries of truth in the world ; a people to whom God had expressly promised temporal prosperity as a reward of faith and obedience ; with whom God had condescended to make a compact, binding Himself to protect them by His *visible* power, if they would obey His law ; to whom He promised a land flowing with

milk and honey, and whom He led thither through a series of stupendous miracles.

Yet, when we read the Old Testament, we find their history as full of punishments as of favours; and if we turn to secular ancient history, we cannot fail to perceive that in arts, arms, commerce, naval power, philosophy, literature, and weight and influence in the then known world, they were inferior to many other nations, who were, for the most part, heathen,—to Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Egyptians, Phœnicians, Greeks, and Romans.

Now this appears to me absolutely opposed to the argument that temporal prosperity is a note of the Church; for *this*, observe, is an instance so complete, that it can never occur again. No people will ever be able to look upon itself as the exclusive choice of the Most High. It is the character of the modern Church to be Catholic, to embrace all nations in her fold, and to be as “a field in which the enemy hath sown cockle:” and we are expressly told that this peculiarity is to continue to the end of the world, if not in all probability to increase. It seems to me, then, that if, as is in point of fact the case, divine punishment is quite as characteristic of the history of the chosen people of God as divine protection; if, as is likewise the case, that people were inferior in temporal greatness and prosperity to many others; if, moreover, as cannot be denied, that people were marked out from the rest of the world in a manner quite different to what any Catholic nation ever can be,—then it follows that we should not expect to see nations prosperous in proportion to their Catholicity. I am far from saying the connection may not exist, I should be inclined to think it does; but it follows the ordinary laws of God’s providence, which are, and ever must be, a mystery to us. Moreover, since the coming of our Saviour on earth, humiliation, suffering, and poverty are to be looked on as His livery; and His prophecies to His Church rather foretell thorns than roses, strife than peace, and humiliation than triumph. Of course, the lowly virtues of the New Testament are applicable to different states of life in different proportions; but there must be a *recognition* of them in the king as well as in the hermit. Heroic, by which I mean self-sacrificing, virtues are, as a general rule, less applicable to fathers of families, simply because, all duties being relative, the duty of a man to his wife and children comes before a larger number of more distant duties. This it is which has led, in the Catholic Church, to the celibacy of the clergy; which is no dogma, but a mere consequence of what I may call *the division of labour* consequent on a more developed state of Christian civilisation. The attire of the glorified Church is to be wrought about with a variety of ornament. Meanwhile, that temporal prosperity should frequently be withheld from the Church, that she should be often hated and despised, that she should be defaced by “spot and wrinkle,” that she should be to many a stumbling-block,—all this seems to me nothing more than what we might be led to expect.

1st. Because she is the body of a Head crowned with thorns.

2d. Because she is like the net, which held many bad as well as good fish.

3d. Because it is easier for her individual members to excel in one thing rather than in many; and therefore intellect, and even moral virtues, will frequently be found dissociated from the Church, which, in imitation of her Divine Master, calls especially the poor, the sinful, and the ignorant: not that she calls them *peculiarly*, but because her *including them* repels the rich, the self-righteous, and the intellectual.

4th. Because where there is "community of saints," there is probably, to a great extent, community of temporal rewards and punishments; as in the Old Testament the innocent suffered *with* the guilty, and in the New the innocent for the guilty.

5th. That as proximity to grace augments responsibility, and diminishes the chance of excuses of ignorance, so it increases the guilt of those who wilfully choose evil rather than good. Sacraments, humanly speaking, cause sacrileges, and faith blasphemy; and this simply through the exercise of man's free-will. We should never forget those awful words of Simeon applied to our Lord, "that He was set for the *fall* and resurrection of many in Israel;" and then we shall wonder less at what seem the more devilish forms of unbelief in the immediate proximity of all that is most holy.

6th. That given an imperfect world, it is easier to bring it to acquiesce in a law of expediency than to submit to one which aims at a definition of right and wrong.

For all these reasons, my common sense is not the least hurt by the fact of the absence of temporal prosperity in the Church in any particular country and at any particular time; though sometimes I might expect to see them culminate together. If I speak of O. H.'s letter as containing a *half-truth*, I claim no more for my own; for I look upon it as a proof of ignorance as well as presumption, to despise truths which must be partial, because they are shown forth by a human intelligence. *Out* of the dogmas of the Church I admit *no* complete truths.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

F.

PROSPERITY, NOT THE PRICE, BUT A REWARD, OF CHRISTIAN VIRTUE.

SIR,—A writer in a Catholic newspaper has been hard on a sentence of mine in your last Number. May I ask room for a few lines in answer to him?

I had said, "Religion may preach poverty to the saint, but it teaches worldly success and the comforts of life to the faithful at large." I did not mean that worldly success was the *wages*, or the

object, of Christian obedience; but I meant that, as a rule, it was the *natural* effect of certain *supernatural* graces, and that it was the extra recompense or present, the *mantissa*, as Maldonatus calls it, the *collarium*, as Cornelius à Lapide calls it, coming from a bountiful Providence upon His consistent, faithful servants.

Our Lord says, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be *added* to you." Maldonatus refers us to the instance of Solomon. St. Paul too says, "Godliness is profitable to all things, having *promise of the life that now is*, and of that which is to come." What is *promised* is *preached*; though I did not use the word "preach."

I think experience too proves the truth of what I have said, as a matter of fact. Poverty may either be the high reward of the saint and faithful Christian striving after perfection, or the punishment of the careless Christian. Those who strive after perfection are the few; as to the *multitude* of Christians, poverty is the token, not of perfection, but of certain great imperfections, or rather great sins. And in like manner, as to the *multitude* of Christians, the absence of poverty is the token of the absence of those particular sins. I appeal to any one who knows the poor, whether, looking at them as a whole, their miseries do not arise from three causes, carelessness and improvidence, drunkenness, neglect of conjugal and parental duty. The absence of these does not guarantee the presence of supernatural virtue; but their presence testifies to its absence. If whole classes of men are without bread, clothing, or lodging, "in labour and painfulness, in much watchings, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness," it is not because they are like St. Paul; but, on the contrary, because they utterly neglect "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever modest, whatsoever just, whatsoever holy, whatsoever lovely, whatsoever of good fame;" whatsoever is of "virtue," whatsoever has the "praise of discipline." Here one great exception of course must be joyfully made, viz. of the poor children who have bad parents, the poor wives who have bad husbands, the poor old grandparents, penitents, though they have sinned in their day. I class all these, whom the Almighty afflicts in love, with St. Paul and the perfect, for they are under the discipline of the perfect; nor have I said that *individuals* have an exact measure of temporal good or evil in proportion to their works; but if a whole independent *community* be in a slovenly, discontented, disorderly, restless, rebellious condition, "incontinent, unmerciful, traitors, stubborn, puffed up, lovers of pleasure more than of God," as St. Paul says (and this I think is the state of good part of Italy), I cannot but think that such a community, such a nation, is in a state of religious decadence.

I did not say in my letter, and do not say, that good Christians will make *splendid fortunes*, or be *better off* than the children of this world; for men who make worldly success their object, and the one object of their lives, and pursue it with energy and prudence, will commonly have their reward where they seek it, and will beat in the race of wealth or honour the good Catholic, who not only does not

make it his sole object, but not his object at all. And in like manner I did not quarrel with the social state of Italy because England *surpassed* her in worldly greatness, but because she was all in confusion, without stable government, without internal union, without civil obedience, without religious peace.

I am tempted here to quote some words of the Council of Paris of 1849; they may be taken as a sort of friendly hint addressed by the Christians of France to the Christians of Italy and their abettors. "It is not true," say the Fathers of the Council, "that in holding the inequality of ranks in society, the Church implies that those hapless persons who are both broken with labour, and yet encompassed with utter penury, are fettered to their misfortunes *without power of change* and *as though by some insuperable fate*, the pressure of which neither can nor ought to be alleviated. This most perverted sentiment, which of old time *was in fashion among the pagans*, is utterly foreign to the Christian doctrine, and is abhorred and detested by the Church.

"Neither is it true that we must understand the Evangelical doctrine concerning the spiritual advantage of pain and its sanctifying power in the sense that it is not lawful for Christians either to desire or to secure a relief of their miseries. For they are taught by the Church to pray daily for deliverance from evil, which in this life is, *in the first place sin, next misery or any trouble*: and, on every opportunity which offers itself, doth the same Church declare that it is both lawful and honourable for those who are in want of the goods of this life, to strive earnestly in order that *every one of them*, by means of his strenuous efforts, and in conscientious ways, may *alleviate the hardship of his condition*, nay further, may succeed, by the assistance of God, in *rising to a more prosperous state*.

"Once more, it is not true that the Church disapproves of either the prudent investigations of the learned or the *wise endeavours of the civil power, for the amelioration of those classes of society which are in want*. What measures soever can be ascertained and established which are salutary for this purpose, we declare to be *worthy of praise, and agreeable to Christian piety*" (Decret. pp. 66-68).

It must be recollected by my critic that these strong sentiments have been "*recognita et approbata*" by the Holy See.

I cannot tell, of course, whether he is a priest, but by his authoritative tone I suppose he is; and if so, I recommend him to "preach" to his poorer people, that if they do not strive hard by conscientious ways to rise out of their abject poverty, they are omitting a course of conduct which the Holy See has pronounced to be "lawful, honourable, praiseworthy, and consistent with Christian piety."

I am, &c.

O. H.

LAY STUDENTS IN THEOLOGY.

SIR,—I beg to direct your writer's attention to a passage in Dr. Newman's recent volume on University Teaching, in answer to his ques-

tion about laymen studying theology. It agrees pretty nearly with a judgment which I have heard, and to which I defer, viz. that laymen may study the Treatises *de Religione* and *de Ecclesia*; but had better keep clear of the high mysteries of faith and of the subject of grace.

After mentioning the reasons which "oblige us to introduce the subject of religion into our secular schools," he proceeds to answer the objection that "it is better for a youth to know nothing [of theology] than to have a slender knowledge, which he can use freely for the very reason that it is slender." He writes thus:

"In the first place, it is obvious to answer, that one great portion of the knowledge here advocated is, as I have just said, historical knowledge, which has little or nothing to do with doctrine. If a Catholic youth mixes with educated Protestants of his own age, he will find them conversant with the outlines and the characteristics of sacred and ecclesiastical history as well as profane: it is desirable that he should be on a par with them, and able to keep up a conversation with them. It is desirable, if he has left our University with honours or prizes, that he should know as well as they the great primitive divisions of Christianity, its polity, its luminaries, its acts, and its fortunes; its great eras, and its course to this day. He should have some idea of its propagation, and the order in which the nations which have submitted to it entered its pale; and the list of its Fathers, and of its writers generally, and the subjects of their works. . . . He should be able to say what the Holy See has done for learning and science; the place which these islands hold in the literary history of the dark age; what part the Church had, and how its highest interests fared, in the revival of letters. . . . I do not say that we can ensure all this knowledge in every accomplished student who goes from us, but at least we can admit such knowledge, we can encourage it, in our lecture-rooms and examination-halls.

"And so in like manner as regards Biblical knowledge, it is desirable that, while our students are encouraged to pursue the history of classical literature, they should also be invited to acquaint themselves with some general facts about the canon of Holy Scripture, its history, the Jewish canon, St. Jerome, the Protestant Bible; again, about the languages of Scripture, the contents of its separate books, their authors, and their versions. In all such knowledge I conceive no great harm can lie in being superficial.

"But now as to Theology itself. To meet the apprehended danger, I would exclude the teaching *in extenso* of pure dogma from the secular schools, and content myself with enforcing such a broad knowledge of doctrinal subjects as is contained in the catechisms of the Church, or the actual writings of her laity. I would have them apply their minds to such religious topics as laymen actually do treat, and are thought praiseworthy in treating. Certainly I admit that when a lawyer, or physician, or statesman, or merchant, or soldier, sets about discussing theological points, he is likely to suc-

ceed as ill as an ecclesiastic who meddles with law, or medicine, or the exchange. But I am professing to contemplate Christian knowledge in what may be called its secular aspect, as it is practically useful in the intercourse of life and in general conversation; and I would encourage it as it bears upon the history, literature, and philosophy of Christianity.

“It is to be considered, that our students are to go out into the world, and a world not of professed Catholics, but of inveterate, often bitter, commonly contemptuous Protestants; nay, of Protestants who, so far as they come from Protestant Universities and public schools, do know their own system, do know, in proportion to their general attainments, the doctrines and arguments of Protestantism. I should desire, then, to encourage in our students an intelligent apprehension of the relations, as I may call them, between the Church and society at large; for instance, the difference between the Church and a religious sect; between the Church and the civil power; what the Church claims of necessity, what it cannot dispense with, what it can; what it can grant, what it cannot. A Catholic hears the celibacy of the clergy discussed; is that usage of faith, or is it not of faith? He hears the Pope accused of interfering with the prerogatives of her Majesty, because he appoints an hierarchy. What is he to answer? What principle is to guide him in the remarks which he cannot escape from the necessity of making? He fills a station of importance, and he is addressed by some friend who has political reasons for wishing to know what is the difference between Canon and Civil Law, whether the Council of Trent has been received in France, whether a priest cannot in certain cases absolve prospectively, what is meant by his *intention*, what by the *opus operatum*; whether, and in what sense, we consider Protestants to be heretics; whether any one can be saved without sacramental confession; whether we deny the reality of natural virtue, and what worth we assign to it.

“Questions may be multiplied without limit, which occur in conversation between friends in social intercourse, or in the business of life, where no argument is needed, no subtle and delicate disquisition, but a few direct words stating the fact. Half the controversies which go on in the world arise from ignorance of the facts of the case; half the prejudices against Catholicity lie in the misinformation of the prejudiced parties. Candid persons are set right, and enemies silenced, by the mere statement of what it is that we believe. It will not answer the purpose for a Catholic to say, ‘I leave it to theologians,’ ‘I will ask my priest;’ but it will commonly give him a triumph, as easy as it is complete, if he can then and there lay down the law. I say, ‘lay down the law;’ for remarkable it is, that even those who speak against Catholicism like to hear about it, and will excuse its advocate from alleging arguments, if he can gratify their curiosity by giving them information. Generally speaking, however, as I have said, such mere information will really be an argument also. I recollect some twenty-five years

ago three friends of my own, as they then were, clergymen of the Establishment, making a tour through Ireland. In the West or South they had occasion to become pedestrians for the day; and they took a boy of thirteen to be their guide. They amused themselves with putting questions to him on the subject of his religion; and one of them confessed to me on his return that that poor child put them all to silence. How? Not of course by any train of argument or refined theological disquisition, but merely by knowing and understanding the answers in his catechism.

“Nor will argument itself be out of place in the hands of laymen mixing with the world. As secular power, honour, and resources are never more suitably placed than when they are in the hands of Catholics; so secular knowledge and secular gifts are then best employed when they minister to Divine Revelation. Theologians inculcate the matter and determine the details of that revelation; they view it from within; philosophers view it from without; and this external view may be called the Philosophy of Religion, and the office of delineating it externally is most gracefully performed by laymen. In the first age laymen were most commonly the apologists. Such were Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Aristides, Hermias, Minucius Felix, Arnobius, and Lactantius. In like manner, in this age some of the most prominent defences of the Church are from laymen; as De Maistre, Chateaubriand, Nicolas, Montalembert, and others. If laymen may write, lay-students may read; they surely may read what their fathers may have written. They might surely study other works too, ancient and modern, whether by ecclesiastics or laymen, which, although they do contain theology, nevertheless in their structure and drift are polemical. Such is Origen’s great work against Celsus. . . . Even, however, if we confine ourselves strictly to the philosophy, that is, the external contemplation of religion, we shall have a range of reading sufficiently wide, and as valuable in its practical application as it is liberal in its character. In it will be included what are commonly called the Evidences, and what is an especially interesting subject at this day, the notes of the Church.”

A letter which has come into my hands from a foreign theologian singularly corroborates some of these remarks, going further than the author. It says, “My opinion is, which many others share, that at present laymen of a certain rank have more need of knowing *dogmatic* theology, ecclesiastical history, and canon law, than priests. The reason is, that in lay company the deepest and most difficult problems in those subjects are discussed. This is seldom done when any priest is present. Moreover, in your country, laymen have better opportunities than priests to correct a thousand false notions of Protestants.”

H.

ON DEVOTION TO HOLY MEN DEPARTED.

SIR,—A theologian, whom without extravagance I may consider of the very highest authority on the point, writes to me as follows on the subject which your correspondent R. M. has started. He says:

1. There is no obstacle against publishing pictures, even with prayers attached, in honour of these martyrs, provided that (1) there is no glory round the head; and (2) the title of Saint or Blessed is not given to them. Moreover, it is fitting (3) that the word "martyr" should not be employed as a special and solemn personal qualification. But we might allowably say "martyred;" "shed his blood for the faith;" "N. M. martyr of the order of Benedictines."

2. There is no obstacle to painting or exposing the portraits of these martyrs in the churches, provided no aureole is given them.

3. There is no obstacle to inserting their lives in the collections of the Lives of the Saints, provided they are not qualified in an undue manner.

4. The private *cultus* of persons who have died in the odour of sanctity, so far from being forbidden in the Church, is, on the contrary, completely authorised.

I will add one remark: Gilbert, who had the pictures of the English Martyrs painted in the English chapel at Rome, probably did things that would not be at present permitted. At that time the wise decrees of Urban VIII. had not been made. These decrees are excessively severe; but they have been softened by interpretation and by usage; as may be seen in Benedict XIV. *de Can. S.* In Italy they are much more facile than on this side the Alps. And yet it was because of the abuses which took place in Italy, that the decrees were made. The devout women of Venice went to burn their candles before the tomb of the Protestant Servite Paolo Sarpi.

C. M.

TRADITIONS OF HISTORICAL POINTS IN THE SCHOOLS.

SIR,—May I be permitted, without pretending to answer a question which will, I hope, be treated by some one more competent than myself, to introduce to the readers of the *Rambler* a passage from Sir Thomas More's letter to Dorpius, which throws some light on the distinction between the *traditional theology of the schools*, and *real historical and patristic learning*, proposed in your last Number for discussion.

"You will perhaps say (writes Sir Thomas)* that in the ancient writers the matters are not so easily found, nor so well arranged, as in these more modern ones, who have collected together all cognate and similar subjects under certain heads, and have sorted each into its own family. In this, Dorpius, perhaps I should agree with you;

* Thomæ Mori Opera omnia, Latine, Frankfort, 1689, pp. 292 et sqq.

I confess that it is convenient, both in literary and in domestic furniture, to have every thing distinct and in its own place; so that you may, at a moment's notice, lay your hand upon it without mistake. It is, I confess, a convenience. But some people make such an inconvenient use of this great convenience, that it would almost have been better for them not to have the convenience at all. And I imagine that this was the chief reason why all the most ancient commentators on the Bible have been so long neglected by most people; because the corrupted judgments of these unhappy wits have persuaded, first themselves and then others, that there is nowhere any thing worth reading that has not been collected into the receptacles of these compendia. So they content themselves with them, and carelessly condemn all else. I myself once fell in with a person of this way of thinking in a bookseller's shop. He was an old man, with one foot already in the grave, and likely to have both there soon. He had already enjoyed the honour of the doctorate for more than thirty years. I happened to say to him that St. Augustine once thought that all devils were corporeal substances.* He immediately bent his brows, and tried to frown down my temerity. So I replied, 'It is not I that say so, father; nor do I defend Augustine for saying so: he was a man, he might be wrong. I believe in him as in a man that was most frequently right; but I do not think that any one man is to be believed in every thing.' Then my friend began to glow with passion, chiefly because of my calumnious imputation upon the great Father. 'Do you think,' said he, 'that I have never read Augustine? I read him before you were born.' Then he would have transfixed me with his angry words, if I had not luckily had proof at hand. As we were in the bookseller's shop, I took up St. Augustine's book *de Divinatione Daemonum*, and turned to the place, and showed it him. After reading the passage once and again, and at length, on the third reading, having with my help begun to understand it, he said, with astonishment, 'Surely I much wonder how Augustine can speak thus in this book; for he certainly does not say so in the Master of the Sentences, which is a book of much greater authority than this.'"

Here I interrupt the course of my author's remarks, because Stapleton, in his *Vita Thomæ Mori*, c. xiii., takes up the quotation at the point to which I have brought it, introducing it with the following heading of his own:

"About the theologians who are versed only in scholastic

* St. Augustine does not quite say this; he speaks of devils having bodies, aerial, not earthly bodies, and so far of the nature of human bodies, that by means of the analogy he answers the objection that, since in their bodies they move more quickly and perceive more keenly than we in ours, therefore their bodies are superior to ours. No, he answers, for the bodies of brute animals are endowed with a faculty of greater speed and of more acute perception than ours have, yet they are not on that account better than ours. He does not appear to notice these passages in his *Retractations*, but the sense of the word "corpus" is very vague in the Fathers. Vid. Petav. de Deo, ii. 1. Other instances are given from St. Augustine, in F. de Lugo de Angel. i. 1.—Ed.

learning, and who neglect the reading of the Fathers and of the Scriptures, contenting themselves with Peter Lombard or Gratian only, and the patristic texts cited by them; he writes, in his Epistle to Martin Dorpius, to exhibit the magnitude of their mistake and of their failing." Then he continues More's text, where I broke it off, thus:

"People of this kidney, who read neither the Fathers nor the Scriptures, seem to me to act like a person who would not look at any Latin Classic, but would only learn the construction of the language from the rules of Alexander, and the words from Perott's *Cornucopia* and from Calepin, because he was persuaded that all Latin words were to be found in these works. And, indeed, he would find the greatest part, and all the choicest of them. For just as, in the recent school-theologians, the texts of the old Fathers are inserted as authorities, so in these grammatical books do the old poets and orators figure, and some, indeed, whose works are no longer extant. But these will never make a Latin scholar, nor the others a theologian, if he studies them alone; even though he may be up in ten thousand of the abstract questions."

Perhaps the circumstance that he writes this in defence of Erasmus against Dorpius, might deprive even More's venerable name of the weight which it otherwise would have given to this letter, were it not that he is confirmed by Stapleton's high authority. As it stands, it must be taken to express the united judgment of our great Martyr and our greatest Doctor. The grammatical works of Alexander, Perott, and Calepin, noticed in the extract, may find their parallel in the grammar, gradus, and delectus of modern days. "As grammar, gradus, and delectus," says More, "do not make a scholar, so scholastic *compendia* do not make a theologian."

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

R. S.

DESIGNS AND PROSPECTS OF RUSSIA.

SIR,—A friend of mine has expressed his views on the subject of the attitude and views of Russia, in connection with the present war, so clearly in an unpublished pamphlet, that I hope you will allow me to set them before your readers as far as your space admits.

Russia, as he considers, is the power destined to gain by the mad and lawless policy of France and Sardinia. The "liberalism" put forward is only the familiar repetition of many another stroke of the kind. Such professions of philanthropic sympathy preceded the disruption of Poland; such talk was heard about Greece and before Navarino, and has now half-severed a new region from Turkey on the Danube, to be soon absorbed like Poland. The strings and levers of the Secret Societies of the Continent are in reality in her hands. She has Legitimacy in one hand, and Revolu-

tion in the other; and is so practised in the game, that she might almost play it blindfold.

How long is it since it has been known to the better informed in every country but England—which is so enlightened that she cannot see—that before Russia's plans in Turkey can be much further developed, Austria must be reduced to at least an inert, suffering, exhausted condition? Austria's Slavic populations must also be taught to look for their future to the cognate Muscovite, and, with those of Turkey, gradually crystallise into Russian provinces, from the Black Sea to the Adriatic.

This assault of France and Sardinia will probably advance Russia morally and politically—though not as yet physically—to all but the accomplishment of that design.

Even a succession of military successes, pitched battles fairly won, can hardly save Austria. She will almost certainly break down in finance, after having, to men's surprise, just raised her head above the level of bankruptcy. Russia will have nothing to do but stand by, guiding events through her satellites in Paris, Turin, and London. If Austria be not sufficiently broken, she can disturb her by conspiracy in her rear, or even by attack. If she be so far broken as to present a prospect of France becoming too powerful, she can head a German alliance, and march to the Rhine, putting Austria once more as ostentatiously as possible in a position of disgraceful obligation for help out of a pit which the helper had dug.

My own impression is, that the financial ruin and the show of help are for Austria, and that military concussion is reserved for France. But who can say? It may depend on the completeness of Louis Napoleon's collusion with Alexander. If he is yet to join in a partition of Turkey, then the whole weight of all calamity may probably fall on Austria. Still, the former course—that, to wit, of hopeless depression of Austria through financial exhaustion, and of France through a defeat at the hands of a new coalition—seems the more likely.

In any event, the real case, as concerns Europe, has not even been hinted at by our wonderful Press and Parliament. On the one hand, a philanthropic impossibility, a lawless propagandism of constitutional forms, is accepted as motive for encouraging the march of France into Italy; on the other hand, a risk of such a thing as French ambition is the utmost motive that has been suggested for misgiving, and for pausing in headlong coöperation with Cavour and the Clubs. Certainly this is, so far, common sense; but how infinitely short of the truths involved, and the motives presented, by three words, "What of Russia?" You will not get that chord touched.

But there are other motives besides those drawn from strategy, and geographical positions, and sympathies of blood and language, which make Russia intent on paralysing Austria, reducing her to a small German state, and slipping the Muscovite bit into the mouths of her Slavic tribes.

The same motives which rendered it clear gain to Russia that the prestige of the Germanic empire—the shadow of that of Rome—should cease, and that Vienna should sink into only the capital of Austria, and her emperor be one, therefore, of a later date than the Romanoff, still prevail. The grandeur of the old imperial dignity is not yet sufficiently stripped from Russia's rival. Like that other august claimant of homage and reverence, the crown of St. Louis, it must be lowered to the dust. Russia must have none but new kings and *parvenu* states, or, at best, decrepit old ones, as the preliminary to enforcing her long-reserved claim to universal imperial sway, and the fruition of her pretended inheritance through Byzantium and the Papeologi.

She has also to make her throne the citadel of man's religious necessities. However strong unbelief and vice and revolution may be, in the long-run Russia knows that men must have order, and all that renders order possible; and that, therefore, religion must reappear, like an Ararat, after every deluge. What strength may be got through these moral necessities, after teaching the world to feel them through successive confusions and desolations, and after breaking down every rival representative of such ideas, Russia means to retain for herself. She may somewhat miscalculate final issues, but, in the mean time, such are among her motives; such are, therefore, among the facts with which we are concerned in viewing such an event as war waged against Austria. Every portion of this subject,—in which England has been only seeing, on the one hand, a tempting vision of a romantic united Italy, and, on the other, a warning spectre of an aggrandised France,—teems, in fact, with Russia's schemes. Her motives and interests, ethnological, geographical, military, political, religious, crowd into the very van of the question. Yet they are unseen, unnamed. Their overwhelming importance is rendered doubly impressive by the dead silence regarding them. Such a demeanour, in the face of such facts, is fearfully ominous; it shows the truth to be so grave as to make the weak look askance, and that where ignorance and panic cannot be supposed, there must be collusion.

One word as to contingency directly affecting our own shores. Which power is likely to do Russia's work of breaking England when her turn comes? Is it Austria? or is it France? Supposing Louis Napoleon to look forward to the humiliation of England as the triumph which is to give to himself fame, and to his dynasty permanence, when can he most safely attempt it,—before or after the crushing of Austria? Austria (like the rest of Germany) might easily be induced to strike a blow to save England, and arrest the domination of France, were she herself standing upright and uncrippled. If French ambition, or rather vain-glory and revenge, are, therefore, ere long to be directed against us, the assault on Austria is a wise preliminary. Our most sure ally will be thus destroyed, not to speak of her dispositions changed by a sense of injury in being abandoned. France will assail us with no alarms

in her rear, but, on the contrary, with Italian ships, and ports, and sailors, added to her own. The temptation, should France entirely triumph in her present war, to pursue the career desired by Russia will be irresistible; and a deadly struggle between the two great maritime powers will end in the possession by a third of the prize for which they contend.

H. H.

Literary Notices.

A Tour in Dalmatia, Albania, and Montenegro, with an Historical Sketch of the Republic of Ragusa. By W. F. Wingfield, M.A. M.D. (London, Bentley.) A record of a short excursion made by the writer into a part of the world that is little known, with the object of ascertaining the condition of the Christian population of Turkish Albania, and that of the Slave nationalities on the eastern shores of the Adriatic. Many interesting details on both these subjects may be picked up in this modest volume.

The history of Ragusa, the "little Venice" of the Adriatic, is interesting, as that of a republic which alone knew how to preserve itself and its maritime commerce by treaty and peaceable means during Turkish ascendancy in the Mediterranean, without compromising its religious faith or political independence, and which only fell at last through voluntarily taking part with Napoleon I. It appears, from late notices in the public prints, likely to figure in the present war.

Mansel's Bampton Lectures. 3d edition. (London, Murray.) We have, as our readers know, already reviewed this able work at some length. We notice it again merely from justice to Mr. Mansel, who has replied to some observations we ventured to make on his omission of any reference to Dr. Newman's works. We need hardly say, for we shall quote his words, how satisfactory and handsome Mr. Mansel's reply is; still, he will be pleased to know that we feel it to be so; moreover, he will not be unwilling perhaps to be assured also that—whatever might be the zeal of friends of Dr. Newman in his behalf—as regards Dr. Newman himself, the notion that Mr. Mansel had passed him over did not once come into his mind; and that the perusal of Mr. Mansel's new preface has been to him simply a surprise and a pleasure,—a pleasure, no part of which has gone in undoing any previous pain. He writes as follows: "It remains only to say a few words on a question of fact, involving one of the most serious accusations that can be brought against the character of an author. A writer in the *Rambler*, to whom in other respects I feel I am indebted for a liberal and kindly appreciation of my labours, has qualified his favourable judgment by the grave charge that the 'whole gist of the book' is borrowed without acknowledgment from the teaching of Dr. Newman, as a preacher or as a writer. Against a

charge of this kind there is but one possible defence. No obligation was acknowledged, simply because none existed. I say this, assuredly with no intention to speak slightly of one whose transcendent gifts no differences should hinder me from acknowledging, but because it is necessary, in justice to myself, to state exactly the relation in which I stand towards him. Dr. Newman's teaching from the University pulpit was almost at its close before my connection with Oxford began; his parochial sermons I had very seldom an opportunity of hearing. His published writings might doubtless have given me much valuable assistance, but with these I was but very slightly acquainted when these Lectures were first published; and the little I knew contained nothing which appeared to bear upon my argument. This is but one out of many deficiencies of which I have been painfully conscious during the progress of the work; and which I would gladly have endeavoured to supply, had circumstances allowed me a longer time for direct preparation.

"The point, indeed, on which the reviewer lays most stress is one in which there was little room for originality, either in myself or in my supposed teacher. That Revelation is accommodated to the limitations of man's faculties, and is primarily designed for the purposes of practical religion, and not for those of speculative philosophy, has been said over and over again by writers of almost every age, and is, indeed, a truth so obvious, that it might have occurred independently to almost any number of thinkers. Doubtless there is no truth, however trite and obvious, which may not assume a new and striking aspect in the hands of a great and original writer; and in this, as in other respects, a better acquaintance with Dr. Newman's works might have taught me a better mode of expressing many arguments to which my own language may have done but imperfect justice. Even at this late hour I am tempted to subjoin, as a conclusion to these observations, one passage of singular beauty and truth, of which, had I known it earlier, I would gladly have availed myself, as pointing out the true spirit in which inquiries like these should be pursued, and the practical lesson which they are designed to teach." He then quotes *University Sermons*, page 351.

Literary Remains; consisting of Lectures and Tracts on Political Economy. By the late Rev. Richard Jones, formerly Professor of Political Economy at the East-India College, Haileybury, and Member of the Tithe and Charity Commissions: edited, with a Prefatory Notice, by the Rev. W. Whewell, D.D. (London, Murray.) Mr. Jones was well known, not only for his eminent practical ability, but for the originality of many of his speculations in political economy. Before his time that science almost aspired to rank with pure mathematics; at least its professors started with universal *à-priori* principles, definitions, and axioms, and from them deduced a series of propositions, which they regarded as demonstrated, often in spite of facts, and as universally true for all mankind, in spite of their utter ignorance of the social state of nine-tenths of the human race. Mr. Jones, on the contrary, insisted on always treating

political economy as a purely inductive science ; he refused to allow that principles that were only proved for England, were to be accepted without proof as true for other countries ; he demanded a survey of all countries and all ages for his *Political Economy of Nations*. Hence arose an amusing contest between the adherents of Mr. Ricardo, the great professor of the *à-priori* school, and Mr. Jones. The dispute was about rent : rent, it appears, according to the pure understanding, is the result of the excess of the produce of good over bad soil ; according to sober observation it is of various kinds,—there are *serf-rents*, *metayer-rents*, *ryot-rents*, *cottier-rents*, and *farmers'-rents*. This appeal to facts, and laborious generalisations, naturally annoyed the disciples of a school which, in speaking of ordinary and vulgar things, so mystified and spiritualised them that no one could recognise them. Mr. Jones's rent was "what is commonly called rent ;" the Ricardian rents are abstract ideas, representing rents that are not actually paid in any country.

The materials for the lectures now published were chiefly gathered during this controversy, which arose from a work of Mr. Jones on rent, published in 1831. This work led to his appointment as Professor of Political Economy at the newly-established King's College, London, in 1833 ; and in 1835 he succeeded Mr. Malthus in the same capacity at Haileybury. Jones was the great animating spirit, one might say the author, of the Tithe-Commutation Act, and the Archbishop's commissioner in carrying out its enactments. For this the Anglican Establishment owed him a debt of gratitude which it never repaid. "He was told by the Government that he was to look for his final provision to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had appointed him to the office of commissioner. . . . But it was never found possible to reward him," all the preferments finding their issues in other directions. Dr. Whewell's publication of these *Remains* is a tribute to an old Cambridge friend.

Mr. Jones's book is one that must be studied by those who wish to become acquainted with the dry subject about which it treats ; a subject necessary for an enlarged political knowledge, but not so necessary as our modern statesmen seem to suppose. Political economy, when regarded as the basis of political science, leads only to the French system, which seems to have no eye but for the formal distributions of power and wealth, without a moment's consideration of the moral basis which should underlie every constitution, political and social. Better is it to consider the moral basis as every thing, than to attribute too much to the formal distribution ; cutting and shuffling the cards is of little use when all the trumps are withdrawn. As the late Duchess of Orleans well remarked, a constitution is something more than a political system ably and dextrously framed ; it is also a combination of reciprocal duties, freely and cordially accepted on both sides. Our great political dangers seem all to proceed from the side of the Benthamite system of mechanical morality.

The Good News of God. Sermons by Charles Kingsley, Rector of

Eversley. (London, J. W. Parker.) Mr. Kingsley is right, and he is wrong, in calling his sermons *news*; for they neither preach the old Christianity, nor do they announce for the first time another Gospel. Mr. Kingsley has to a certain extent made himself the mouthpiece of the religious tendencies of the present age, which, as F. Faber says, takes man's side and not God's, and seeks rather to reduce God to the level of ordinary good men, than to raise the standard of goodness to any superhuman level. Mr. Kingsley's moral theology is that of Socrates; his dogmatic theology that of Socinus, garnished with dressings appropriate to his position as rector of Eversley. The first of these sermons is on the beatific vision: this, for the new school, is not the vision of God "as He is;" but it is "to see, if but for a moment, with the mind's eye, what God is like." This vision is attained by induction—by observing and gathering up in the memory the impressions of all the goodness in the world. "When we see countless drops of goodness scattered about in the world, a little good in this man, and a little good in that, shall we not say there must be one great sea of goodness from whence all human goodness comes? And where can that be, but in the very character of God Himself?" Therefore, if we want to know what God is, we must "think of all the noble, beautiful, lovable actions, tempers, feelings, which we ever saw or heard of;" and then make a compound of them, to make one perfectly good character, in which we can dimly contemplate God. In this sense all men, the most abandoned even, have had the beatific vision; for they all at some moments love goodness; "and all the wisest men among the heathen, the men who have been honoured and even worshiped as blessings to their fellow-men, have agreed, one and all, in the great and golden rule, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul, and thy neighbour as thyself:;' " but no man, Christian or heathen, can love a God who "feels feelings and does deeds which, if a man felt or did, we should call him arbitrary, proud, revengeful, cruel,"—such as condemning the sinner to hell.

The second sermon is entitled "The Glory of the Cross." Here Mr. Kingsley says we see a sight that was not given to the heathen to behold,—the complete triumph of *magnanimity*. And this is all he sees on Calvary!

On the whole, the volume may be characterised as an attempt to reduce the Bible to terms of Aristotle or Plutarch; to do away with all distinctions between the natural and supernatural, and to identify heathen with Christian virtues. The world has been tempted to this course by the spectacle of men calling themselves Christians, and setting up as models of religious persons, and yet totally lacking all the virtues which ought to be common to all men, Jew, Gentile, or Christian; lacking honesty and honour, and all the qualities which characterise a true gentleman. A protest on behalf of the natural virtues was wanted. Mr. Kingsley goes too far in his protest when he virtually protests against the supernatural.

Contemporary Events.

HOME AFFAIRS.

1. *The New Parliament.*

On April 19, in her Speech dissolving Parliament, her Majesty used the following words, which express more of political principle and personal feeling than is usual with such state-papers :

" We are commanded by her Majesty to inform you that it is her Majesty's intention forthwith to dissolve the present Parliament, with a view to enable her people to express, in the mode prescribed by the constitution, their opinions on the state of public affairs.

" Her Majesty commands us to inform you that the appeal which she is about to make to her people has been rendered necessary by the difficulties experienced in carrying on the public business of the country, as indicated by the fact that within little more than a year two successive Administrations have failed to retain the confidence of the House of Commons; and her Majesty prays that, under the blessing of Divine Providence, the step which she is about to take may have the effect of facilitating the discharge of her high functions, and of enabling her to conduct the government of the country under the advice of a Ministry possessed of the confidence of her Parliament and people."

Parliament accordingly was dissolved in the ordinary way on April 23, and the elections followed.

The new Parliament, the sixth of the present reign, was opened by the Queen in person on the 7th of June.

Two questions were before the country,—its home policy and its foreign; the questions of Parliamentary Reform, and of the French Alliance. The former of the two administrations, of which the Queen speaks in her speech on dissolving Parliament, had lost power on the foreign question; the ministry which succeeded had lost the confidence of the House of Commons on the home question, and had only staved off a resignation by the dissolution, which had been the main subject of her Majesty's Speech.

2. *Debate in the Commons on the Queen's Speech, and Amendment on it carried.*

In her Speech in opening the new Parliament, the Queen spoke of both questions thus :

Of the foreign, which, though it had taken a very different shape, was substantially the same as that on which Lord Palmerston lost office :

" War has been declared between France and Sardinia on one side, and Austria on the other. Receiving assurances of friendship from both the contending parties, I intend to maintain between them a strict and impartial neutrality; and I hope, with God's assistance, to preserve to my people the blessing of continued peace."

Of the home, which was the difficulty of Lord Derby :

" I should with pleasure give my sanction to any well-considered measure for the amendment of the laws which regulate the representation of my people in Parliament; and, should you be of opinion that the necessity of giving your immediate attention to measures of urgency relating to the defence and financial condition of the country will not leave you sufficient time for legislating, with due deliberation, during the present session, on a subject at once so difficult and so extensive, I trust that at the commencement of the next session your earnest attention will be given to a question, of which an early and satisfactory settlement would be greatly to the public advantage."

In the House of Commons the Opposition moved an amendment on the Address in answer to the Royal Speech. Lord Hartington, who was their spokesman, said :

" I do not suppose her Majesty's Government can complain of the course which we are taking. The issue which we now put to the House is simply that which the Government have already put to the people. And it is to that question that I now ask the represen-

tatives of the people to give an answer. In dissolving the late Parliament, her Majesty's Government had not done so upon any particular measure. They did not complain that they were not supported in their foreign policy. They simply put this issue to the country; they said, 'For two sessions we have endeavoured to carry on the business of the country, without being able, upon a party division, to go into the lobby with a majority of this House.' They said that such a position was no longer consistent with their own dignity or advantageous to the country. And they asked the country to return a House of Commons which might convert their minority into a majority. Sir, I hope that the decision of the challenge which has been thus thrown down, and which we thus accept, will, at the conclusion of this debate, be received by both parties in a spirit of fairness and of honour. For myself I can say, and I believe that in so doing I speak the sentiments of almost all the members on this side of the House, that if we are defeated on this amendment we shall cheerfully and willingly bow to the decision of the House. We shall then know what is our position as an opposition."

The Amendment ran in the following strong form of words:

"We beg humbly to submit to your Majesty that it is essential, in order to secure these satisfactory results, and particularly in the discharge of these high functions, that your Majesty's Government should possess the confidence of this House and of the country; and we deem it our duty respectfully to represent to your Majesty that such confidence is not reposed in your Majesty's present Government."

On the morning of June 11, 2 a.m., the division took place, when Government was defeated in a House of 633 members by a majority of 13; 323 being for the amendment, and 310 against it.

3. *Resignation of Conservative Ministry; their Successors.*

Government resigned a few hours after the division. The Queen in consequence sent for Lord Granville in the afternoon of the same day. What ensued will be told most accurately in the words, not of the noble lords who

took part in the proceedings, but of the *Times* newspaper; we say this because on the one hand there is less of diplomatic reserve in its account, and on the other because Lord Derby in the House implied, and Lord Granville also, that it was so true that it ought never to have been published. The account is as follows: her Majesty desired Lord Granville to form an administration, strong in ability and parliamentary power, which should also at the same time comprehend within itself every section of the Liberal party. She said, moreover, that she preferred to betake herself to Lord Granville, because it was invidious to have to choose between two such meritorious statesmen as Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell. Lord Granville in consequence addressed himself to both statesmen. Lord Palmerston, "in the handsomest manner, and without the slightest hesitation," consented to wave his claims and to act under Lord Granville; but Lord John Russell "was disposed to insist upon conditions which would render any union or coöperation impossible, whether under the premiership of Lord Granville or any one else." What Lord John's motive was for such a course of action was not stated. The issue was, that the Queen sent for Lord Palmerston, who, 'after some days' negotiation, succeeded in forming a ministry; Lord John Russell undertaking the Foreign Secretaryship; on the other hand, Lord Clarendon being excluded from the ministry. The arrangement of offices runs thus:

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury,
Viscount Palmerston.
Chancellor of the Exchequer,
Mr. Gladstone.
Home Secretary,
Sir G. C. Lewis.
Colonial Secretary,
Duke of Newcastle.
India Secretary,
Sir C. Wood.
Foreign Secretary,
Lord John Russell.
War Secretary,
Mr. Sidney Herbert.
First Lord of the Admiralty,
The Duke of Somerset.
Lord Chancellor,
Lord Campbell.

President of the Council,
Earl Granville.
Privy Seal,
Duke of Argyll.
Postmaster-General,
Earl of Elgin.
President of the Board of Trade,
Mr. Cobden.
President of the Poor-Law Board,
Mr. Milner Gibson.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster,
Sir G. Grey.
Secretary for Ireland,
Mr. Cardwell.

—
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland,
Lord Carlisle.

The only light thrown upon the intended policy of the new Administration is contained in the address of Lord Palmerston to the Liberal members of Parliament, at their meeting prior to the opening of the session. On that occasion he insisted strongly on the duty of maintaining a strict neutrality, and declared he could not foresee any circumstance which would render the hostile intervention of England necessary. He added that, in his opinion, nothing was so conducive to the interests of Europe or the preservation of peace as the maintenance of a strict alliance between England and France. He had also stated his desire, we believe on the hustings, that Italy should be rid of the Austrians.

As a mark of special favour, her Majesty has proposed to confer on Lord Derby the Order of the Garter; and, as there is no garter vacant, she will summon an extraordinary chapter for that purpose. Her Majesty also confers the Grand Cross of the Bath on Lord Malmesbury and Sir John Pakington.

4. *The Cardinal Archbishop and the Irish Elections.*

One of the most remarkable, and not the most pleasant, incidents of the late elections, is what the Liberal and provincial papers called "the alliance between the Government and Cardinal Wiseman." The allegation was for the most part a mere party cry, used against the Government; and it has doubtless had its effect in adding to their unpopularity: but it has been taken up by persons of such high character, that it is disrespectful to them to say that, untrue though it might be, there was

no plausible reason for believing in it. We cannot bring ourselves to think that there might not have been more caution on the Cardinal's part, when his conduct has excited the displeasure of gentlemen who have the claims to our respect which are possessed by Mr. More O'Ferrall. On the hustings he professed his conviction, that adhesion to the Conservative party on the part of Catholics tended to overturn all the interests, and defeat the best hopes, of Ireland; and then he went on to say that "not only for the peace and real welfare of the country, but for the credit of the religion to which he belonged, he deeply and sincerely deplored that such a course had been adopted; and, if persevered in, it would end disastrously. He the more sincerely deplored it, if statements, which he had heard, were true; that the course had been *instigated by persons of high position*—persons who, *above all others*, should be the last to do any thing that would breed ill-feeling and ill-will among men." The newspapers which reported these words, considered them directed against the Cardinal Archbishop; and, as we have seen no other explanation of them, we cannot doubt that such is the case.

When unwarrantable proceedings are imputed to the highest dignitary of the English Church by Catholics of consideration, it is useless to complain of similar imputations on the part of the enemies both of Catholicism and Conservatism. What we have a right to complain of, or rather not to *complain* of (because it is not worth complaining of what is only one instance out of ten thousand wrongs of a similar kind which are the lot of the Catholics of England)—what we wish to protest against and deny is, the *motive* which has been alleged to account for the conduct of the Cardinal and others in supporting the Conservative Ministry. So strong an effort has been made, it is said, that it implies the presence of an unusual power to have caused it. That a newspaper, a long-established and able organ of Catholic and Irish principles, should have taken part with an Orange ministry, and avowed a Conservative policy, may well startle the English public, which has ever associated Catholics with Whigs and Destructives. That, for the first time since the Reform Bill, the Tories should have a majority in the Irish elec-

tions, is a phenomenon which needs to be accounted for. On the other hand, is it not obvious that the Pope must be looking about for political support amid the perils which at present environ him?—and why should he not give his orders to the English Cardinal to make overtures of alliance to a Conservative Ministry, who, like himself, have need of assistance? It is easy to make out a case on almost any subject. The Prince of Wales has been at Rome; the Pope has made the Queen a present, as the Cardinal himself confesses, and her Majesty has acknowledged it in an autograph letter. Moreover, it is no secret that in the highest quarters at Rome Lord Palmerston inspires no respect or confidence whatever; whereas the Conservative leaders, enemies though they be, are felt to be men of honour and of their word. And it might easily be made to appear, to prejudiced minds, that the Cardinal's progress through Ireland last autumn was part of a pre-arranged scheme, intended to pave the way for a grand manœuvre in the tactics of the Catholic body.

Nor was this all that has disquieted the English mind. The Cardinal had never been a Tory; how does he himself account for his change? His friends and others, who have felt or acted with him in his support of the Conservatives, have assigned a reason; and a weaker reason, it is said, could not have been put forward. Nothing is so little tolerated by the public as the pretence that any one acts on so impossible a motive as pure philanthropy; and a philanthropical reason was assigned by Catholic prelates and priests as their inducement for wishing a continuance of the Conservatives in power. "Every man has his price," said a celebrated statesman; had the Cardinal boldly avowed that he wished to advance his social position by means of his new friends, had he asked to be received at court, had he bargained for office or emolument in behalf of Catholic noblemen, lawyers, or Members of Parliament, his conduct would have excited no suspicion, every thing would have been above board and honest; but that a prince of the Church, that a member of the Sacred College, that one who bears the historic name of Cardinal, should care for the souls of the degraded and outcast, and should pretend that he was exerting himself so strenuously in the political arena, and

incurring the unpopularity of Derbyism, as well as the slur of tergiversation, merely for the sake of old women in workhouses, and criminals in gaols, this was too great a tax upon the credulity of the 19th century; and was to be accepted as true only when Louis Napoleon is credited as having crossed the Alps simply from a hatred of despotism, and at the agonising cry of Italy.

We are but drawing out in our own words what the opponents of Lord Derby have really suggested. Strange to say, men have been found who were *naïve* enough to put upon paper the ground of their suspicion. It was the statement of the editor of a provincial journal, whose argument has been so many times repeated up and down the country, as to show how exactly it expressed public opinion on the point to which he directed attention. A Catholic nobleman, he said, had gone about making promises to his co-religionists from Lord Derby, on condition of their supporting his government; and what ostensible promises forsooth? "To put the Catholics *into power*?—not at all; to make *magistrates* of the Catholics?—not at all; *but* to place Catholic gaol-chaplains in England upon the same footing as Catholic chaplains in Ireland." Who, indeed, *could* believe—who with a grave face could profess—that a Cardinal was able to care one jot about prisoners, or their spiritual consolation, or the low jobbing priests whose business it might happen to be to administer it? If his Eminence were telling the real reason for his political conversion, doubtless we should not have had to listen to an explanation so ludicrously insufficient; and the concealment of the price was the index of the secret articles of a treaty.

All this suspiciousness is as absurd as it is ignorant; at the same time, it is an evidence that our public patronage of Lord Derby has not turned out to his political advantage. We fear he must be saying, Deliver me from my friends. Catholics have brought on him a great deal of odium. The Conservative party must be every thing that is bigoted and retrograde, the world reflected, if Catholics can have canvassed for it *con amore*. Its foreign policy has in consequence been treated with great injustice. Lord Derby was thought to favour the Austrians because we favoured him; and Lord Malmesbury's sensible and out-spoken despatches,

published since the elections, have astonished those who thought that the Premier, at the price of Catholic votes, had made a bargain with the Vatican to go to war with France that Austria might retain her hold upon Italy.

Lord Derby, in his speech at the opening of the new Parliament, put the matter in its true light; and it is remarkable, that the account which he gives of the feeling of Catholics towards his ministry is identical with the avowal which some years since we heard made on the subject abroad, in a quarter to which we have already alluded. The Conservatives, it was said, are our enemies, but they will play us no petty underhand tricks; we can trust their word. Lord Derby said in the debate on the Address: "I know that, before the late dissolution, I was told by Conservative Roman Catholics that they were very glad to be able, without violating their religious or their political principles, to give a support to the present government which they had never been able to give to any Conservative government before. But, my lords, they based that support not upon any compact that has been entered into with them by her Majesty's Government, but on that which has been done in the face of the world, not for political considerations, unless you give that name to the obligation which we have as a government always felt under to do what was right. Subsequently to the dissolution, it was stated in a letter written by Cardinal Wiseman to a gentleman in Ireland, and extensively circulated, that Roman Catholic gentlemen had given the Government their support, but without any pledges on the part of Government, *because they found that as Roman Catholics they were treated with more frankness and in a more straightforward manner by the present than by any former government.* I do not think that is a support of which the Government on the one side, or the Roman Catholics on the other, have any reason to be ashamed. We acted as we have done towards the Roman Catholics in the discharge of our public duty, because we thought they were fairly entitled to be treated in the manner we have treated them. We shall pursue the same course. We shall give them whatever indulgence—or fair dealing, I should rather say—we think them legitimately entitled to;

but we shall not give them the slightest thing that can prejudice or impair the interests of that Church to which we belong, and which we think we are bound to support. If Roman Catholic gentlemen think themselves justified in giving their support to a government which *makes them no promises but that it shall deal them substantial justice*, I say that neither they nor we should be ashamed of that measure of support, such as it is, which they have given."

5. *Policy of English Catholics towards Political Parties.*

In thus professing to feel no difficulty at the Cardinal Archbishop's change of political views, we are not implying that we are the active *partisans* of those views, or are *urging them upon others*. We do not presume to criticise what he has done; but, for ourselves, looking at the thing in itself, we like neither Whig or Tory well enough to canvass in their interest. We are speaking only of the Catholic constituency; and, speaking of them, we express our belief that it is a mistake to attempt to form Catholics into a political party, and a greater to make Whig principles or Tory principles the basis of such a party's action, if there be a party. As to the latter of these points, so little do we care for mere politics in our representatives in Parliament, that we see no inconsistency in voting for two candidates who stood against each other, and whom others were plumping for, so that they both promised to be fair to Catholic interests. We do not say that mere political interests and principles, and points of social expedience, may not rightly interest a Catholic's vote; nor are we denying the possibility of a state of parties such, that absolute truth and right are on one side, and that the other cannot deliberately be advocated without an error or a crime; we only say, that if a man aims at serving Catholicism, and nothing short of it, by his vote in the year 1859, he may fairly vote for two men, one of them an anti-Establishment Independent, and the other a Laudian high-churchman, provided that they both, for instance, promise to do us justice in the matter of schools, army and navy, workhouses, prisons, and the like. But, if this be so, then it is an absur-

dity to talk of an alliance of Catholics with Conservatives, or Whigs, or Liberals, or Progressists; unless, and so long as, any one of these parties takes upon itself the championship of Catholic grievances, and the other parties combine to perpetuate them. And in this point of view we assent to an observation in the speeches of several members of Parliament, Mr. Sidney Herbert especially, who says, speaking of the influence of the Derby ministry on Catholic voters, that "he had no reason to complain of the course which the Government had taken as respected the public interest; and if they had broken up a system which had led to differences in Ireland of an interminable nature, they had conferred a great advantage. He had no objection to see Irish Roman Catholics sitting on the opposite benches, for *he had always considered it a great misfortune that every Irish Roman Catholic should feel bound to support the Liberal*, and every Protestant in Ireland should belong to the Conservative party; and any thing granted in a conciliatory spirit to the Irish Roman Catholics, without imputation of dishonour to the Government, was in its favour, being in itself wise policy."

Surely this is the language of common sense: Catholics in these countries are not all taken out of one class; they do not form one body naturally; how can you bring them into one body? and why should you expect them to have the opinions of any one set of public men? The Wesleyans, the Quakers, the Unitarians, for the most part belong to one class in society; it is natural that their political, social, and secular interests should be the same. It is not so with Catholics, for the very reason that their Church is Catholic. It gathers of every kind; it has specimens of every class in the community, of high and low, rich and poor, learned and unlearned. The children of Whigs and of Tories, the families of high-church dignitaries, the heirs of great territorial possessions, professional men, high-born ladies, agriculture, trade, manufactures, the shopkeepers of towns, mechanics, peasants, the poor, the indigent,—they all meet together in our religious pale. How can we ever attempt to form one social body, one temporal interest, out of them? It is notorious to the world

that, in matter of fact, Catholics are broken up into parties: some men wonder at this, others are scandalised at it; but it takes place from the nature of the case. It cannot be otherwise. When a community is Catholic, every interest, every principle, finds its place there: every centre has its circumference; "birds of a feather flock together." But when it is Protestant, and Catholics are *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*, the accidental yield of a barren soil, then there will exist among Catholics associations the most fantastic, and combinations the most incongruous, viewed in a secular aspect, as being all brought together by unity of faith in what is unearthly. Here, there will be a chaos of atoms, without the commanding archetypal minds to divide them off into sets and bring them into shape. There, we shall find original intellects, with the power of influence, at war with each other, because they can find no dependents to cluster around them, and to locate them at safe distances from each other. "Every thing is double," says a sacred writer: but this is not meant to apply to a small and sparse communion such as ours, in which it need not surprise us though every thing were odd, every thing wanted its fellow, correlatives were hunting for each other, and contraries were linked in indissoluble bonds.

Nor does this description do full justice to this peculiarity of the Catholicism of these islands. Each place, as well as each class, has its own characteristics; and the interests of the Church, which are the same every where, are worked out by different methods, according to the particular town or the particular county. In consequence, every place must take care of itself, and measures may be said to be good or bad according to the latitude. This is true to that extent, that we have heard sagacious men say, that even in Ireland, a Catholic country, the existing divergence of diocese from diocese was almost in the nature of things. The Archbishop of Dublin cannot, from tenderness to the souls of his flock, imitate the excursive movements of an Archbishop of the West; and political concord is rudely overmastered and shattered by ecclesiastical expedience. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same remark applies to England also.

How chimerical, then, is the attempt to form a sort of Catholic political union! We hold by what was spoken and published some years ago, though we cannot afford space for more than a few abridged sentences of the extended argument. "You see," the speaker said, "where your success lies, and how you are to secure it. If a battle is coming, stand on your own ground, not on the ground of others; take care of yourselves. This I would say, not only to you, but, if I had a right to do so, to the Catholics of England generally. *Let each stand on his own ground; let each approve himself to his own neighbourhood: if each is defended, the whole is secured. You are attacked on many sides. Do not look about for friends; trust no body of men. Your strength lies not in your number; you are enabled to mix with others while you are few, and you might be thrown back upon yourselves when you became many. It would be a terrible state of things, to be growing in material power, and to be growing also in a compulsory exclusiveness.*"

With these feelings strong and deep in our minds, we confess we desire as little as we expect that the Catholic constituency should be Whig, Tory, or Radical. It is our belief that, as things are, a more powerful influence is exerted upon our public men and upon the public mind, and, in consequence, more real advantage, when Catholic gentlemen try to serve their country in their own place, and follow out their own political convictions in their own way, than when they attempt to agree among themselves on some political creed, in which they cannot all take part without compromise or without the danger of inconsistency in the event. Accordingly we look with no sort of pleasure at all at the popular impression of the moment, which newspapers hostile to the Cardinal have created, that his Eminence in political matters represents English or Irish Catholics, or that he is the spokesman of any foreign authority, Cardinal Antonelli or Cardinal Barnabo, who could not possibly divine, nor would dream of deciding, what was best for Catholic interests in Dublin or Limerick, in Manchester, Birmingham, or Nottingham. On the other hand, it is a great gratification to any Catholic to find his own *independent* view of politics on

any occasion the same as those of the Cardinal; and no writer in the *Times* or the *Morning Post* shall deprive us of the honour of having our personal convictions confirmed by so high an authority, by attempting to get it believed that what has been our honest conclusion from premisses is a mere inspiration.

6. *The Catholic University.*

If Lord Derby has been embarrassed by the cry which has been raised against the Cardinal, Catholic interests have suffered from it also. Perhaps it was simply impossible for a Conservative Ministry to grant a charter to the new University, when once the attention of the Orange faction was drawn to the negotiation. However, we have gained that which in the *Rambler* for May was laid down as the main point, *recognition* of the University as existing. The charter now is but a matter of time, provided only that the University and its rulers are true to themselves. We then said, and we now repeat, "The very fact of the deputation, and its admission to an audience, is the victory of the University. The present government may refuse the request, there may be delay and trouble in carrying the matter through, but it will be simply the University's fault and no one's else if it does not now get a charter." We will add, that we cannot complain though that internal energy and life, which we know to exist in the University body, should be tried. Nothing is done well which is simply done from without. A present struggle is the token and warrant of future independence.

The other act of justice which the Conservative Ministry had shown a disposition to exercise towards us has, since the dissolution, been urged upon the public with great effect at the meeting to which we shall now refer.

7. *Meeting in behalf of the free exercise of the Catholic Religion in Gaols and Workhouses.*

This great meeting was held on Wednesday, June 8, in St. James's Hall, Piccadilly. It was held with the full and cordial approbation of all our Bishops, who, however, judged it best not to be present, and was attended by a great number of Catholic noblemen,

members of Parliament and others, without any distinction of political party, as well as by some of the principal clergy of the metropolis. The great hall was filled, and the platform crowded. Mr. Langdale was in the chair, and the resolutions were moved and seconded by Lord Stafford, Lord Herries, Lord Feilding, Lord Campden, the Master of Lovat, Hon. T. Stonor, Hon. I. F. Arundell, Mr. Mon-sell, M.P., Mr. Maguire, M.P., Mr. J. P. Hennessy, M.P., Col. Vaughan, Mr. R. Berkeley, Mr. Blundell, Mr. Acton, Mr. Ryley, Mr. H. Wilberforce, and Dr. Manning, who was the only ecclesiastic who took this formal part in the proceedings. The main object of the meeting is contained in the second resolution, which ran as follows :

“That a large number of her Majesty’s Catholic subjects, inmates of prisons and workhouses in England and Scotland, are at this time deprived of the full and free exercise of their religion, both as to religion and education, viz. : By defective and unfair registration in workhouses, by obstruction to the entrance and intercourse of the Catholic clergy with Catholic inmates, by strong inducements held out for the attendance of Catholics at Protestant services, by visits in private of Protestant chaplains, by the placing of Catholic children under Protestant teachers and in Protestant schools, by removing them from the legitimate influence of their pastors and friends, and by various other ways of management in detail.”

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

1. *Concluding Acts in the Negotiations for Peace upon the Ultimatum of Austria.*

Our record of foreign affairs in May carried down the course of negotiation between the contending powers to the *ultimatum* which Austria sent to the Sardinian Government,—that, unless the latter agreed in three days to disarm and disband the volunteer corps, she would declare war. This message was delivered April 23d, Easter Eve. It was delivered at a moment when Sardinia had consented to disarm, on condition of having a seat in the Congress; and when England had made a proposition, which had been accepted by France, Prussia, and Russia, to the effect that the Congress should be formed after the precedent of Laybach in 1821, into which plenipotentiaries from the Italian States were admitted; and that its meeting should be preceded by a general disarmament. France professed to make this concession as an extreme deference to the wishes of Queen Victoria; accompanying it, however, with the stipulation, that Sardinia, and not the other Italian States, should have the right of voting. Austria, however, seems to have received the English proposition with some feeling of indignation, and returned an immediate answer in

the negative. The reasons were stated in the official Vienna Gazette of the 23d. Sardinia was not one of the great powers, she was one out of various Italian States; yet she had for some time past, officiously and presumptuously, put herself forward as the representative of all Italy. Now she has the incredible assurance to wish a seat among the great powers in Congress assembled, and in that capacity. The precedent of Laybach would not sanction her presence there at all: Naples, at Laybach, asked the assistance of the great powers; did Sardinia do so now? The fact was, that Sardinia had for years been incessantly insulting and offending Austria, and the very first step in any negotiation was, that she should cease doing so, and, as the only and true guarantee of her ceasing, that she should disarm. Austria had said so all along; she said so now; she had said so in March; she had not waved the point even when she agreed to a general disarmament, as was evident from the letter of her minister to the Russian minister, M. de Balabine. Her consent to a general disarmament, as a condition of a Congress, was independent of her demand upon Sardinia to disarm, and subsequent to it. But when Sardinia made a seat in that Congress the condition of her own disarming, over and above the preten-

tiousness of doing so at all, she mixed up two transactions, which in the mind of Austria had ever been altogether distinct. Accordingly Austria could not listen to any such proposal, though England made it.

"Austria had supported during a series of years, with a patience which had no example in history, and which had generally been appreciated, the incessant attacks, the secret intrigues, and the most evident violations of treaties on the part of her weaker neighbour. To require, in addition to this, that the great Austrian Power should place itself on an equality with this state, was really an exaction which was rejected by every moral sentiment, and would be considered by all Europe as incompatible with the honour and dignity of the Austrian government."

She followed up this refusal by the *ultimatum* of which we have already spoken. Formal protests, earnest on the part of England; severe on the part of Russia, were at once returned to this refusal; Prussia contenting herself with expressing her regret, and throwing the consequences of the act upon Austria.

2. *Opinions of English Political Parties upon the Austrian Ultimatum.*

The surprise and annoyance of the English ministry were expressed in Lord Derby's speech at the Mansion-House dinner, on Easter Monday, April 25th. "One last effort," he said, "the Government had made to bring the various countries concerned to an understanding as to the terms on which they were to meet in Congress. It had failed; Austria had rejected the proposal. In consequence the Congress too had failed, and a united effort on the part of Europe was impossible: England could no longer afford to trifle with resultless negotiations. The ministry accordingly had reverted to their first effort of mediation, as a single power, between the belligerents, and had addressed both France and Austria a proposal to this effect, on one of two conditions, either of their disarmament, or of at least their inaction. He did not know what hope he could cherish of peace. He viewed with deep regret the fearful respon-

sibility which Austria had taken on herself; he had instructed the British minister at Vienna to deliver a formal protest against the step; and, while the progressist and propagandist spirit of Sardinia deprived her of the moral support of England, he could not in any way justify the criminal precipitation with which Austria had brought on herself consequences which no human foresight could determine. He should be unjust if he did not acknowledge how cordially and loyally the English ministry had been supported by Prussia throughout." After this exposition of his views on the conduct of Austria, Lord Derby went on to explain himself on a point in which his speech in parliament had been misunderstood. When he there spoke of an *armed neutrality* as being the necessary position for England in the event of a continental war, he meant no more than an attitude of watchful observation; and that, not for the purpose of profiting by the misfortunes of others, but of defending and protecting our possessions, and securing our power of independent action according to events, and giving force to such mediation as those events might render possible.

These last remarks were called forth by some reflections of Lord John Russell on the hustings upon the warlike intentions of the Government; and from their historical importance, we record here both his and Mr. Bright's sentiments upon this point. Lord John Russell had said, a few hours before Lord Derby's speech, "If, instead of arming in the first place, and then referring matters to a Congress of foreign Powers, they had first had a Congress, who would have fairly talked the matter over, and thus brought to light the result of the different deliberations of the European Powers, that Congress would have seen what the grievances and complaints in Italy were, and whether those grievances might not be considered; nor until those interests were so considered should the Powers have brought their armies into the field." He continued, "It was hoped when our ambassador was in Paris, in 1856, that there would be some improvement in the mode in which the quarrels of the different Powers might be settled,

instead of rushing to arms. But in the present case they had not followed that course, the question of a Congress not being entertained till after the armies had been collected. It was difficult to say who was in the right. Austria showed herself determined to strike the first blow; but nothing could excuse France and Sardinia for going to arms. Lord Derby had said, that our position must be, to a certain extent, an armed neutrality. But there was a great difference between an armed neutrality and the country being in a state of efficient defence. By an armed neutrality a country signified that she meant to take part with one side or the other. The armed neutrality on the part of Russia was meant to be offensive to this country, and we sent Nelson to put an end to it. He thought our position ought to be one of fair and honest neutrality; that we should be prepared at all times for an attack, but we should not take part with either of these great Powers who were going to war. No doubt we had treaties, such as that for the neutrality of Belgium; and if an attempt were made to conquer that country, we must interfere; but without our running to her defence, she would doubtless under any circumstances remain in possession of her freedom."

Mr. Bright on the same day spoke as follows, at Birmingham:

"On the face of it the contest is to determine whether the despotism of Austria or of France shall exert the greatest influence in the Italian States. For us, for every man, such a contest must have intense interest. But we live in these islands surrounded by the salt water; we have no fear that any body from Italy, from Austria, or France, will make an assault on these shores. If they shall do so, the power which in past times has preserved these realms is competent still to defend them. What I ask you to beware of is this, lest your rulers of 1859 pursue the course which your rulers did in 1793. If you had not gone into war, then you would have had Parliamentary Reform thirty years earlier than you had it; you would never have had the Corn Laws. Your present expenses of seventy millions annually might have been

less than a quarter of that amount, and the great body of the working classes of England might have been in a position of independence and comfort and education. Now, then, what are we to do? Are we to have our minds distracted from the question of Parliamentary Reform? Are we to run away from this substantial chase, and pursue the phantom of military glory? I am committed irrevocably, as far as any influence I may possess, to the entire abstention of England from any intermeddling whatever in this war. I value the blood, I value the sweat, I value the comfort, I value the lives, and I value the homes and happiness of the people of this country; and never, never for one single moment, at the behest of power, or the call of popular frenzy and popular clamour, shall any man ever charge me with being accessory to the sacrifice of the happiness of the common people on the altar of sanguinary war."

3. *Termination of the Negotiations.*

A few words will suffice to relate what followed on the proposal of the English ministry to take up the mediation between the two empires at the point where it had been broken off, after Lord Cowley's return from Vienna, on the Russian proposition of a Congress. Austria accepted it, and delayed the declaration of war, which was to follow on the rejection by the Sardinian Government of her *ultimatum*; and countermanded the entrance of her armies into the Sardinian territory. France declined to accede to it, at least without a previous discussion; which, though commenced, was cut short by the military movements which, on her hesitation, were at once prosecuted by Austria.

4. *Attempt of France to gain the active Coöperation of England in the War.*

April 26. The French minister sent to the English Government to invite them to an alliance with France in view of the struggle which was commencing. Lord Malmesbury, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, replied on May 5th, in a long despatch, from which the following passages are extracts. First it speaks of Austria: "Her Majesty's Govern-

ment believe that it never was intended by Europe, when recognising the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom as a portion of the dominions of the house of Austria, that Austria should, as a consequence of that recognition, be at liberty to extend her moral and material sway over all other portions of the Peninsula. It was never intended that Austria should constantly and systematically interfere beyond her frontier; that she should at will influence the internal administration, and occupy by her armies the territories, of other Italian States, whose independence was recognised by the same treaties. It never was intended that the progress of freedom and of social improvement in the Italian States should be left to the control of Austria." Then of Sardinia: "By violating her treaties of extradition with Austria; by fostering deserters from her army; by rallying in Piedmont the disaffected spirits of Italy; by menacing speeches against the Austrian Government, and by ostentatious declarations that she was ready to do battle as the champion of Italy against the power and influence of Austria,—Sardinia invoked the storm, and is deeply responsible to the nations of Europe. Her Majesty's Government saw this dangerous policy with apprehensions, which have now been realised; and they cannot forbear remarking that the first and immediate effect of the war which it has caused has been the suspension of constitutional government in Sardinia itself." And then he declines the invitation: "Her Majesty's Government feel themselves precluded, by every consideration, from associating themselves with France in the present struggle. They believe that that struggle will be productive of misery and ruin to Italy; and, so far from accelerating the development of freedom in that country, will impose upon it a heavier burden of present ruin and future taxation. They feel that the war, on whatever principles it may be commenced, and whatever objects it may contemplate, will infallibly become a war of extreme political passions and opinions. They cannot but dread that the events in Italy may react on other nations, and that, at an early day, all Europe will be involved in the conflict."

It must be observed, that quite as forcible and still earlier was the decided refusal of the same Derby ministry to have any thing to do with the Austrian side of the dispute. "England would remain a neutral spectator of the contest," Lord Malmesbury informed the Austrian minister on January 12th, "and in no way would public opinion render it possible to assist Austria as against her own subjects."

5. *Sardinian Manifestoes on the breaking-out of the War.*

On April 27th, the king of Sardinia, repudiating the summons contained in the Austrian ultimatum delivered on the 23d, addressed his troops by a Proclamation in the State Gazette. "Austria," he said, "which increases her arms on our frontiers, and threatens to invade our territory, because liberty here reigns with order, because not force but concord and affection between people and sovereign here rule the state, because the cries of suffering of oppressed Italy here find a hearing,—Austria dares to intimate to us, armed only in defence, that we are to lay down our arms and put ourselves in her power. The outrageous intimation called for a worthy reply. I have disdainfully rejected it.

"Soldiers! I announce this to you, certain that you will take to yourselves the outrage offered to your king,—to the nation. The announcement I give to you is the announcement of war. To arms, then, soldiers!"

After referring to their former war with Austria, and to their companionship with the French on the Tchernaya, he continued, "Advance, then, confident of victory, and adorn your banner with fresh laurels; that banner which, with its three colours, and with the chosen youth which, here assembled from all parts of Italy, are gathered together beneath it, points out to you that you have for your task the independence of Italy—that just and holy enterprise which will be your war-cry."

In another proclamation, addressed to his subjects and to the Italians, he spoke of Austria as not daring to submit her cause to the judgment of a European congress; of her breaking her promise given to Great Britain; of her assailing Piedmont because

Piedmont was not deaf to Italy's cry of anguish; and he added, that he had "no other ambition than to be the first soldier of Italian independence."

The Chamber of Deputies at Turin adopted without discussion projects of law investing the government, during the war, with absolute executive and legislative power, thus suspending the constitution, by a majority of 110 votes to 24, as was noticed by Lord Malmesbury above.

6. *Austrian Manifestoes and Explanations on the breaking-out of the War.*

(1) *Proclamations of the Emperor.*

On April 28th, the Emperor of Austria published a proclamation, addressed, "To my people." "I have ordered," he says in it, "my faithful and gallant army to put a stop to the hostile acts which for a series of years have been committed by the neighbouring state of Sardinia against the indisputable rights of my crown, and against the integrity of the realm placed by God under my care, which acts have lately attained the very highest point. By so doing I have fulfilled the painful but unavoidable duty of a sovereign. My conscience being at rest, I can look up to an omnipotent God, and patiently await His award. With confidence I leave my decision to the impartial judgment of contemporaneous and future generations. Of the approbation of my faithful subjects I am sure. More than ten years ago, the same enemy, violating international law and the usages of war, and without any offence being given, entered the Lombardo-Venetian territory with the intent to acquire possession of it. Although the enemy was twice totally defeated by my gallant army, and at the mercy of the victor, I behaved generously, and proposed a reconciliation. I did not appropriate to myself one inch of his territory; I encroached on no right which belongs to the crown of Sardinia as one of the members of the European family of nations. I insisted on no guarantees against the recurrence of similar events; the hand of peace, which I in all sincerity extended, and which was taken, appeared to me to be a sufficient guarantee. The blood which my army

shed for the honour and right of Austria I sacrificed on the altar of peace."

He then goes on to state, how Sardinia, after the peace, continued a perfidious agitation in Lombardy; how patient he had been; how his necessary precautions in Lombardy became a pretext for more open hostility; how he had accepted the mediation of the Congress, insisting, however, as a preliminary, on Sardinia's disarming; how she would not do so, except on terms which he could not accept; how he took a last step in directly calling on her to disarm, and to dismiss the Italian free corps; and how her refusal involved an appeal to arms. He proceeds:

"I have ordered my army to enter Sardinia. I am aware of the vast importance of the measure; and if ever my duties as a monarch weighed heavily on me, it is at this moment. War is the scourge of mankind. I see with sorrow that the lives and property of thousands of my subjects are imperilled, and deeply feel what a severe trial war is for my realm; which, being occupied with its internal development, greatly requires the continuance of peace. But the heart of the monarch must be silent at the command of honour and duty. On the frontiers is an armed enemy, who, in alliance with the revolutionary party, openly announces his intention to obtain possession of the dependencies of Austria in Italy. To support him, the ruler over France, who under futile pretexts interferes in the legally established relations of the Italian peninsula, has set his troops in movement; detachments of them have already crossed the frontiers of Sardinia. The crown which I received without spot or blemish from my forefathers has already seen trying times. The glorious history of our country gives evidence that Providence, when there is a foreshadowing that the greatest good of humanity is in danger of being overthrown in Europe, has frequently used the sword of Austria in order to dispel that shadow. We are again on the eve of such a period. The overthrow of the things that be is not only aimed at by factions, but by thrones. The sword which I have been forced to draw is sanctified, inasmuch as it is a defence of the honour and rights of

all peoples and states, and of all that is held most dear by humanity.

"To you, my people, whose devotion to the hereditary reigning family may serve as a model for all the nations of the earth, I now address myself. In the conflict which has commenced you will stand by me with your oft-proved fidelity and devotion. To your sons, whom I have taken into the ranks of the army, I their commander send my martial greeting. With pride you may regard them; for the eagle of Austria will, with their support, soar high.

"Our struggle is a just one, and we begin it with courage and confidence; we hope, however, that we shall not stand alone in it. The soil on which we have to do battle was made fruitful by the blood lost by our German brethren when they won those bulwarks which they have maintained up to the present day. There the crafty enemies of Germany have generally begun their game when they have wished to break her internal power. The feeling that such a danger is now imminent prevails in all parts of Germany, from the hut to the throne, from one frontier to the other. I speak as a sovereign member of the German Confederation when I call attention to the common danger, and recall to memory the glorious times in which Europe had to thank the general and fervent enthusiasm of Germany for its liberation. For God and fatherland!"

He had the day previous addressed the forces of his second army, under the command of Count Gyulai. "With confidence," he said, "I confide the rights of Austria to the best of hands,—to the hands of a tried and gallant army. Your fidelity and bravery, your exemplary discipline, the justice of your cause, and a glorious past, are the guarantees which you give me of your success. Soldiers of the second army, it is for you to secure victory to the spotless flag of Austria. Take with you into battle the blessing of God and the confidence of your Emperor."

(2) *Circular Despatch of the Austrian Government.*

On the 29th, Count Buol, the Austrian minister, sent the Emperor's Manifesto to his people to the diplo-

matic agents of the government, accompanying it with a despatch, of which the following are extracts:

"Our cabinet had accepted the last proposition of mediation of Great Britain; but our adversaries have not followed that example, and we have accordingly submitted to arms the defence of our cause.

"Austria has tranquilly supported a long series of offences from an enemy weaker than herself, because she knows that her high mission is to preserve, as long as possible, the peace of the world; because the Emperor and his people know and love the labours of a progressive pacific development, which leads to a higher degree of prosperity. But no man of just mind and of upright heart can now doubt the right which Austria has to make war on Piedmont.

"Piedmont has never sincerely accepted the treaty by which, ten years ago, she promised at Milan to live in peace and friendship with Austria. Twice beaten in war,—which had been caused by her mad pretensions,—and although she had been cruelly punished, that state still maintains her former views with a deplorable tenacity. The son of Charles Albert appears passionately to desire the day when the inheritance of his house, which had been restored to him in its integrity by the moderation and magnanimity of Austria, should be for the third time made the stake of a game disastrous to the world.

"The ambition of a dynasty whose vain pretensions, touching the future welfare of Italy, are neither justified by the nature nor by the history of that country, has not hesitated to form an unnatural alliance with revolution. Deaf to all warnings, it has surrounded itself with the malcontents of all the states of Italy; and the hopes of all the enemies of the legitimate governments of the Italian peninsula have found their chief support at Turin. A criminal abuse has been made of the national feelings of the Italian people. Endeavours have been made to keep up and encourage disturbances in Italy, in order that Piedmont might have a pretext for hypocritically deploring the state of Italy, and for assuming, in the eyes of shortsighted and senseless people, the part of liberator.

"To assist this rash undertaking an unbridled press every day endeavoured to carry beyond the frontiers of the neighbouring states a moral insurrection against the order of legitimate things. Out of love for those hollow dreams of the future, and in order to secure to herself support from abroad, Piedmont took part in a war, in which she had no concern, against a foreign power, and sacrificed her soldiers for a foreign object. She was also seen at the Conferences of Paris, with a presumption quite new in the annals of diplomacy, to criticise with effrontery the governments of Italy, her own country,—governments which had never offended her.

"But that nobody might believe that these wild desires and efforts were associated with the smallest sentiment in favour of the peaceful prosperity of Italy, the angry passions of Sardinia redoubled whenever any of the Sovereigns of Italy followed the inspirations of indulgence and conciliation.

"When their Imperial Majesties visited the Italian provinces, receiving the homage of their faithful subjects, and marking every step by conferring a host of benefits, the journals of Turin were allowed freely to advocate regicide.

"When the Emperor intrusted the administration of Lombardy and Venice to the Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian his brother, no pains were spared at Turin to cause the Prince's noble intentions to be repaid with ingratitude.

"The Court of Turin, having once entered upon the path in which its only choice was either to follow the revolution or take the lead, could not but more and more lose the power and the will to observe the laws which regulate the relations of independent states. Under the most frivolous pretexts, Sardinia declares herself liberated from the obligations clearly imposed by treaties, as proved by the conventions with Austria and the Italian states, for the extradition of criminals and deserters. Her emissaries overrun the neighbouring states, exciting soldiers to disobey their chiefs; treading underfoot all the rules of military discipline, Piedmont admitted deserters into the ranks of her own army.

"Who, after this, can any longer doubt that that government regarded as the chief obstacle the rights which Austria derives from treaties, and accordingly sought to get rid of them by all the means of a dishonest policy? Europe, which sees in the respect of existing treaties the palladium of its repose, received with well-merited disfavour the declaration containing the assertion that Sardinia considered herself attacked by Austria, because Austria would not relinquish the exercise of the rights and duties conferred by treaties; because she maintained her right to keep a garrison in Piacenza,—a right guaranteed by the great powers of Europe; and because she presumed to form alliances with other Sovereigns of the Italian peninsula for the common defence of their legitimate interests. There remained but one other pretext, and that was alleged accordingly. The Cabinet of Turin declares that all remedies for the state of Italy would be merely palliatives, as long as the Austrian dominion extends over the Italian soil. This is an open attack on the territorial possessions of Austria. Such is, stripped of the tissue of falsehoods with which it was enveloped, the truth respecting the line of conduct which for ten years past the House of Savoy has followed, at the suggestion of unprincipled advisers.

"Austria is a conservative power, with whom religion, morality, and historical right are sacred. It knows how to estimate, to protect, and to weigh in the scales of equality what is noble and legitimate in the national spirit of countries. Her extensive dominions consist of different races, of different languages: the Emperor embraces them all in the same love; and their union under the sceptre of our august dynasty is advantageous to the whole of the great family of European nations; but the pretension of forming new states, according to the limits of nationalities, is the most dangerous of all Utopian schemes.

"To put forward such a pretension is to break with history; and to seek to carry it into execution in any point of Europe, is to shake to its foundations the firmly organised order of states, and to threaten the Continent with subversion and chaos. Europe feels this, and she attaches herself the

more firmly to the territorial divisions fixed by the Congress of Vienna at the close of an epoch of continental wars with as much regard as possible to historical conditions. There is not a power whose possessions are more legitimate than those in Italy, restored to the House of Hapsburg by the congress which reëstablished the kingdom of Sardinia, and made it the brilliant present of Genoa.

"Lombardy has been for centuries a fief of the empire of Germany: Venice was given to Austria in exchange for her giving up her Belgian provinces. Thus, therefore, what the Cabinet of Turin calls the true reason of the discontent of the inhabitants of Lombardo-Venetia—showing thereby itself the utter want of foundation of its other alleged grievances, namely, the domination of Austria on the Po and on the Adriatic—is a solid and unquestionable right in every respect, and one which the Austrian eagles will preserve from all attack. Those beautiful countries have prospered more rapidly than could have been hoped, after the long and painful years of revolution.

"Piedmont, therefore, does not trouble herself about populations which are suffering and oppressed; but she rather interrupts a regular state of things and the development of future prosperity.

"The revolution, so carefully kept alive in all the peninsula, has promptly followed the impulse given it. A military rising has taken place at Florence; it has compelled his Imperial Highness the Duke of Tuscany to leave his states. Insurrection reigns at Massa and Carrara, under the protection of Sardinia.

"But France, which for a long time past, we repeat, has shared that terrible moral responsibility,—France has hastened by acts to assume it altogether. The Government of the Emperor of the French caused, on the 26th of this month, his *chargé d'affaires* at Vienna to declare that he should consider the passage of the Ticino by the Austrian troops as a declaration of war against France. While we were still waiting at Vienna for the reply of Piedmont to the summons to disarm, France caused her troops to enter Sardinia by the land and sea frontiers, knowing well that

by so doing she placed in the balance the weight which would carry the last resolutions of the Court of Turin.

"And why, we ask, were the legitimate hopes of the friends of peace in Europe thus to be annihilated by a single blow? Because the time had arrived at which projects long meditated in silence have arrived at maturity; at which the second French empire desires to give substance to its ideas; at which the political state of Europe, based on right, is to be sacrificed to its illegitimate pretensions; at which the treaties which form the basis of public European power are to be replaced by the political wisdom which the power which rules at Paris has announced to the astonished world.

"The traditions of the first Napoleon are resumed. Such is the signification of the struggle on the eve of which Europe is placed.

"The Emperor Francis Joseph, the chief of our empire, although he deplores the evils which will be occasioned by the impending war, has confidently placed his just cause in the hands of Divine Providence. He has drawn the sword because guilty hands have attacked the dignity and honour of his crown; he will combat with the profound sentiment of his right."

7. *French Manifestoes and Explanations on the breaking-out of the War.*

(1) *Speeches and Despatches of the French Government.*

On the 25th of April, Easter Monday, the legislature assured the Emperor of their support in rescuing Italy from Austrian domination. The ministry replied, on the 27th, that "the Emperor had been forced into war, in spite of the moderate tone of his negotiations, by the aggressive conduct of Austria; but that the war would certainly be limited to Italy, provided the other German powers comprehended that it was merely an Italian question, which concealed no plan of conquest, and could produce no revolutions."

On April 26th, as the despatch of Count Buol, extracted above, reminds us, the French Government notified to the Court of Vienna through their minister there, that if the Austrian

troops crossed the Piedmontese frontiers, France would regard such an invasion of an allied country equivalent to a declaration of war.

On April 27th, the French Government addressed a circular to their diplomatic agents in foreign courts, in explanation of their view of the position in which France now stood, in relation to Austria and the Italian question. Among other things, this despatch stated, that the abnormal condition of Italy, creating discontent and underhand agitation, tending to an inevitable crisis, and demanding a wise anticipation, was understood by England, Prussia, and Russia quite as well as by France. France, though taking her share in initiation and in action, nevertheless was only coöperating in a collective labour; nor could she depart from that attitude until an aggression took place against Piedmont on the part of Austria, which Austria, by solemnly repudiating in prospect, seemed to recognise as a provocation of such departure. Such was the case, that when England, with the assent of France, Prussia, and Russia, had just settled the conditions on which the collective action for the settlement of the question was to take place, Austria, to the astonishment and with the disapproval of the three mediating powers, suddenly committed herself to an act which was equivalent to a declaration of war. What they merely protested against, France, from her ancient traditions and geographical position, was imperiously called upon to resist in act. She had not exerted an interested influence in Italy for half a century; she had not aroused the remembrance of historical rivalries and struggles; she had but asked what treaties intended and the three powers wished,—that Italy should be independent. Austria, on the other hand, after disturbing the European balance of power by encroachments on the free action of the other Italian states, was now attempting to dictate to Piedmont,—Piedmont, who held the key of the Alps on the French frontier,—Piedmont, who was united to France by ancient remembrances, common origin, and a recent alliance of the sovereign houses. The Emperor Louis Napoleon was faithful to his first words on mounting the throne, that he was not animated by any personal ambition or

desire of conquest. He had already shown that moderation was the soul of his policy; and now he had positively no desire to separate himself from his allies. He entertained a firm hope that the British Government would continue that moral union which involved one common policy, which would confine the struggle to its present limits. Russia, as the French Government was perfectly convinced, would direct her efforts to the same end; and Prussia too, as her present impartial and conciliatory spirit showed. As to the other German powers, ordinarily so calm and self-possessed, France could only behold with sorrow an excitement which had come upon some of them; they ought to understand that they are not menaced by war, and that they might contribute much to circumscribe its duration and extent.

On April 29th, Count Walewski, on withdrawing the French *chargé d'affaires* from Vienna, wrote to him to the following effect: "The French Government has felt bound to apprise the Court of Vienna that its ultimatum, and the eventualities so clearly foreseen as its consequences, give rise, by the side of the general question, till then treated in common by the cabinets of Paris, Berlin, London, and St. Petersburg, to a question altogether French; for Sardinia lies at our very door, covers part of our frontiers, and forms the last obstacle to the extension of an influence which England, Prussia, and Russia, as well as ourselves, consider of a nature to compromise the equilibrium of Europe."

May 3. M. Fould, Minister of State, laid before the Senate a statement of the negotiations with the powers up to the time when Austria, separating her action from that of the other cabinets, took the resolution of addressing an ultimatum to Sardinia. "This communication was received with shouts of *Vive l'Empereur!* on which the president rose, and said that he interpreted these acclamations as an expression of loyalty and devotion. The war was nothing else than the response to an aggression; it was the consequence of a policy which had ever maintained a sympathy between France and Italy, so that the great events of the latter were considered

to belong to the former. The Emperor could not allow Turin, which is the key of the Alps, any more than Rome, which holds the keys of the Church by the hands of a holy and venerated Pontiff, to fall under the usurping yoke of an influence hostile to France. Italy must be restored to her nationality; not revolutionised, but liberated. That beautiful country, threatened with a master, would find a liberator."

May 13. In the Corps Législatif, Baron de Richemont, in bringing the report on the addition of 140,000 men to the army, said: "The object of the war is clearly defined, and the scene of the struggle is circumscribed. It is necessary to put an end in Italy to the ambition of a power which, by its perpetual encroachments, by the mistrust and the violence of its absolutism, and by the discontent and miseries which it strews in its path, has reached the point of at last exciting against her in the heart of the Italian people irreconcilable hatred and an exasperation so violent that a revolutionary explosion might at any moment take place, leading to the most serious consequences to Europe. Such an intolerable state of things must be put an end to, and Italy must be pacified by her independence being secured. But there is for France an interest more direct and more imperative,—that of maintaining the security of her frontiers by protecting Piedmont from the attacks of Austria. This twofold object, which the Emperor has proposed to us, we will energetically pursue: we will not hesitate, at any sacrifice, to place Italy in a normal situation; to guarantee our frontiers for ever; and thus to secure to our country, as well as to Europe, the benefits of a durable peace."

(2) *Declaration of the Emperor Louis Napoleon.*

On the 3d of May, the French Emperor made the following communication to the Corps Législatif:

"Austria, by ordering the entry of her army into the territory of the King of Sardinia, our ally, has declared war against us. She thus violates treaty and justice, and menaces our frontiers. All the great powers have protested against this act of aggression, Piedmont having accepted the conditions

which ought to have insured peace. One asks, what can be the reason of this sudden invasion? It is because Austria has driven matters to such an extremity, that her dominion must either extend to the Alps, or Italy must be free to the shores of the Adriatic; for every corner of Italy which remains independent endangers the power of Austria. Hitherto moderation has been the rule of my conduct, but now energy becomes my first duty. France must now to arms; and must resolutely tell Europe, I wish not for conquest, but I am determined firmly to maintain my national and traditional policy. I observe treaties on condition that they are not violated against me. I respect the territory and the rights of neutral powers; but I boldly avow my sympathy with a people whose history is mingled with our own, and who now groans under foreign oppression. France has shown her hatred of anarchy. Her will was to give one power sufficient strength to reduce into subjection abettors of disorder and incorrigible members of old factions, who are incessantly seen concluding compacts with our enemies. But she has not for that purpose abandoned her civilising character. Her natural allies have always been those who desire the amelioration of the human race; and when she draws the sword, it is not to govern, but to free. The object, then, of this war is to restore Italy to herself, not to impose upon her a change of masters; and we shall then have upon our frontiers a friendly people, who will owe to us their independence. We do not enter Italy to foment disorder, or to disturb the power of the Holy Father, whom we replaced upon his throne; but to remove from him this foreign pressure, which burdens the whole peninsula, and to help to establish order there, based upon lawful, satisfied interests. In fine, then, we enter this classic ground, rendered illustrious by so many victories, to seek the footsteps of our fathers. God grant that we may be worthy of them! I am about to place myself at the head of the army. I leave to France the Empress and my son, seconded by the experience and enlightenment of the Emperor's last surviving brother. She will understand how to show herself worthy of the grandeur of her mission. I confide

them to the valour of the army which remains in France to keep watch upon our frontiers, and to guard our homes. I confide them to the patriotism of the National Guard. I confide them, in a word, to the entire people, who will encircle them with their affection and devotedness, of which I daily receive so many proofs. Courage, then, and union! Our country is again about to show the world that she has not degenerated. Providence will bless our efforts; for that cause is holy in the eyes of God which rests on justice, humanity, love of country, and independence."

8. Attitude of Russia.

On April 26th, while the world was engaged in watching for the commencement of hostilities on the part of Austria against Piedmont, the British public was startled by the news that there was an alliance, offensive and defensive, between France and Russia. Next, it was said, that there were two treaties: by the first, Russia bound herself, in the event of France entering into a war with Austria, to assist her by the coöperation of her fleets in the Baltic and Mediterranean, and to place an army of observation of not less than 50,000 men upon the Austrian frontier; by the second, she bound herself to declare war against Austria within fifteen days of her entering Piedmont. This alliance, it was further said, was ascertained to be existing at the time that Lord Cowley was at Vienna. As to the second of the two treaties, the event disproved it; but the report of the former was soon confirmed or accounted for by an announcement on the 29th, that a Russian army, 60,000 strong under General Luders, had crossed the Dnieper, and threatened the Galician frontier of Austria. On hearing these reports, the English Government applied for explanation to the Russian minister Prince Gortschakoff, and received for an answer his "personal guarantee as a man of honour" that, "though there might be a written engagement between France and Russia," nevertheless such arrangement "contained nothing which in the most distant way could be interpreted as constituting a hostile alliance against" England, as some newspapers worded it, against Eu-

rope, as others. Another account of this engagement came from the French minister; and it had been communicated to the English Government, as Mr. Disraeli said, "voluntarily, some time ago." It was to the effect, "that in case of a war between France and Austria, Russia would assemble an army of observation on her German frontier; and that she would do by the same right as England had to send a commanding fleet to the Mediterranean." Count Walewski further said, that "all allusions to Eastern questions had been specially avoided in the understanding with Russia," which was not "of a nature to affect in the slightest degree the interests of Great Britain." Furthermore, the Russian Government, upon the report getting into circulation, declared that "there was no treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, between the two countries; but that, when all Europe was arming, Russia was meeting the emergency, and retained at this juncture perfect liberty of action."

This was in April. On June 7th, it was said by Lord Howden in the House of Lords, "that he had great reason to believe that, within the last three weeks, something had been concocted or consolidated on this subject which had or had not come to the knowledge of Government."

9. Attitude of Germany.

No country has shown any desire for military action at this crisis but Germany; and Germany, from one end to the other, Protestant as well as Catholic, is in a state of excitement against the French, which presents a singular contrast to the dislike or disapprobation of war which prevails elsewhere. Even as early as the beginning of March there were longings among the German populations for the re-annexing Alsace and Lorraine to the fatherland. In May the war feeling showed a wonderful intensity. "You cannot imagine," says a German, writing from Germany, as the English papers quote him, "the frantic excitement which prevails. We in Saxony are always somewhat enthusiastic, but in Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden, all along the Rhine, there is but one voice,—the frantic desire to fight. Our existence is at stake.

My feelings against Louis Napoleon are mild, compared with those of others. 1813 is in every one's mouth. If Prussia spoke the faintest word, if Frankfort gave the order to move an army towards the Rhine, there would be but one shout of enthusiasm all through Germany. You never can feel what it is to have for a neighbour, at the head of forty millions, a man whose ambition is only equalled by his rascality."

A writer in the *Augsburg Gazette* cries out for an immediate march upon Paris. Louis Napoleon is the aggressor, the treaty-breaker, and his system a nightmare and a plague. Trieste belongs to the German Confederation, and its vessels have been captured by French cruisers. The French flag must be hauled down in the territory to the eastward of Luxemburg, Metz, Nancy, and Bâle. England is for us, in spite of Palmerston. Russia is so slow in moving, that she cannot oppose or harm us. Let us stamp out the flame. One single well-aimed blow will purify the air. What are we waiting for?

We are not surprised to be told by another writer, that the political excitement has reached such a height, that the rulers will soon be obliged either to direct their artillery against the French, or against their own subjects. Ems and Wiesbaden have given to all the French tradesmen and artisans orders to quit the country. The deputies at Baden have declared to the Grand Duke that all Germany must take part in the struggle. The popular feeling at Munich is one of exasperation against the government for its hesitation. What the Prussian Chambers feel on the subject will be mentioned presently.

However, the princes and the aristocracy of the various states do not seem at all behind the people. Many men of rank and standing have offered their services, as volunteers, to Austria; and many members of the reigning houses and of the first families are in her army. At an extraordinary sitting of the Diet, it was resolved to place the garrisons of all the federal fortresses on a war footing: Hanover made a motion, though she ultimately withdrew it, that a corps of observation should at once be placed on the Upper Rhine; and the King of

Bavaria is said to have distinctly declared that he will not remain neutral. Whatever variations there may be in the state of apprehension or the desire for immediate action in the several governments, they one and all seem to be actuated by that remarkable sentiment of "fatherland," which has been the growth of the peace.

10. *Attitude of Prussia.*

To this sentiment, the Prussian Government is no stranger; though, to the great discontent of the rest of Germany and of the Prussian people, she is desirous of a position of neutrality or mediation. In the debate in the Prussian Chamber on May 12th, when the extraordinary supplies were voted, all the speakers were against Louis Napoleon, and in defence of their fatherland. One speaker complained of the lack of energy and patriotism in the government report. Austria might indeed be fighting for herself, not for Germany; but Austria formed a German nucleus; no Prussian could forget it. Frenchmen had no fear of God, love of truth, justice, or consistency; Germans had. Another danger existed in *Idées Napoléoniennes*, born in 1839. These ideas embraced Italy, the Rhine, England, and Russia. Lord Derby, in speaking of the aggression of Austria, was unparliamentary. Prussia would soon stand side by side with her on the battle-field. At the same time, he had no sympathy with the despotic acts of Austria in Italy, or her secret treaties. If France had concluded an alliance with Russia, it was Prussia's duty to arm to the teeth. Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland would stand by Prussia. The ghost of Chatham would rise to warn England. Another speaker thought that the whole of Germany ought to give their adhesion to the money vote; Prussia's calling was to defend the interests of Germany. Another declared that he had no sympathy with the French system of government. The man who had once broken faith could not restore it. When the time came, Prussia would draw her sword. Sardinia, in joining the revolution and calling in foreigners, had lost all claim to respect.

However, the position of Prussia is full of difficulty. She cannot, indeed, view with satisfaction the presence of

the French in Italy, and she may dread lest they should next make their appearance on the Rhine; but she has contending interests.—one is, not to strengthen Austria, the other, to please Germany; and when the way to please Germany is nothing else than to strengthen Austria, it is a very delicate matter to find the precise line by which, without aggrandising the imperial power, she may head and lead the fatherland. She claims to have the decision of the time for commencing military action. On the other hand the Austrian Government is said to be unwilling to grant the political initiation and military command which she asks, except at a price which she is unwilling to pay, viz. her engaging to defend the existing territorial state in Lombardy. She, on the contrary, promises Germany that not a German shall be touched without her resenting it, but she will not attack France till France attacks Germany. And in closing the Chambers on May 14th, the Prince-Regent declared: "Prussia is determined to maintain the basis of European public right, and the balance of power in Europe. It is Prussia's right and duty to stand up for the security, the protection, and the national interests of Germany. Prussia expects all the German confederate powers will stand firmly by her side in the fulfilment of that mission, and trusts that her readiness to defend the common fatherland will merit their confidence."

Her negotiations with Austria were said in the middle of June to be approaching to a termination. Austria was said to have used the diplomacy of the smaller courts, which till now have been closely allied with Prussia, especially Anhalt and Turingen; but without avail. Her influence was paramount in Hesse, Nassau, Darmstadt, and Brunswick. Hanover and Saxony showed a strong leaning to her. Wurtemberg, Bavaria, and Oldenburg, though desirous of coming to an understanding with Prussia, so far leant to the sentiments of the southern states as to consider that the time would soon come for a decision. Further, the philo-Austrian princes declared that they would become the allies of Austria, with or without the consent of Prussia, and act altogether independent of the latter. But here, to their

no small amazement and consternation, that power informed them, through the official channel of diplomacy as well as the government organs of the press, that she would regard such a proceeding as a declaration of war. Moreover, the Prussian government instantly adopted measures that seem to menace the second-rate sovereigns with coercive proceedings in the event of their acting upon their threat. An army of 30,000 men has already posted itself on the northern frontier of Saxony. Another corps of 50,000 men is now marching to Erfurt to be near the central railway of Germany, so that Prussia might stop by a demonstration of military force the attempt of any of these princes to succour Austria by some rash act of hostility against France. An armed mediation seems to be her attitude. Such are the fragmentary, and perhaps incoherent, rumours which are all that, in the absence of state-papers, we are able to collect.

11. *Attempt of Austria to gain Russia.*

Attempts have been made by Austria to move the court of St. Petersburg from the position which it has taken up, but apparently without success. Once or twice an impression prevailed in the diplomatic circles of Vienna, that Prince Windischgrätz, who was personally acceptable to the Czar, was leaving on a mission to St. Petersburg, with power to make concessions to the Russian Emperor. Yet he did not go; and the news was confirmed that Prince Gortschakoff had declared to Count Karolyi, whom the Austrians had sent to him, that Russia would observe neutrality only so long as the German Confederation abstained from the war; that the Russian court had numerous complaints to urge against the court of Vienna; that it did not mean to bind itself to any one, but to keep clear of European complications; as it had said once before, that for the moment events must speak, and that good relations could not be established between the two courts while Count Buol retained the portfolio of foreign affairs. Many days had not elapsed from the publication of these accounts, when the

news came that Count Buol had resigned office. Count Buol was a friend of the English alliance. It is said that he hoped that English influence would have availed to secure the neutrality of the Adriatic; that, failing in this object, and becoming responsible for the unlucky delay of the Austrian troops at the beginning of the war, he found his place untenable. It was prophesied by some that these proceedings were preludes to a reëstablishment of a good understanding between Russia, Austria, and Prussia, that is, of the Holy Alliance.

Nothing has yet justified this expectation. If the Russian journals are any index of the leaning of their government, it certainly is not in the direction of Austria. They make no hesitation in reproaching Austria for having seized as much of the Italian peninsula as ever she could lay hands upon, till that famous land has become the vassal of the House of Hapsburg; that she hates Piedmont for having successfully withstood her encroachments in her own case and for suggesting to the Tuscans, Romans, and the rest of the Italian peoples a similar resistance. She now refuses to yield one inch of her pretensions to Italy; she calls the question vital to her. She does so as relying upon the sympathies of Great Britain and the subserviency of Lower Germany. Yet she had most rashly rushed into war without the coöperation of any one great power, and though by very trifling concessions she might without war have secured the possession of her Italian provinces. She has been for a long while devoted to the maledictions of nations, which will receive their fulfilment in her defeat and humiliation.

12. *Attempt of Russia to calm Germany.*

Remarks such as the above are the expression of feeling; for the political view taken by Russia of the true position of Germany relatively to the war, we must consult the circular despatch of Prince Gortschakoff, dated May 27 (N.S.). It is too long, however, to allow of more than an abstract of it here. He writes thus:

"First, the British government had already informed the States of the

German Confederation that the latter had no *casus fœderis* to make war upon: and that, if they made war without one, and the war became generalised, England would observe a strict neutrality, and would not guarantee the German coasts from any attack. Next, France had solemnly declared that she entertained towards Germany no dangerous feeling of any kind, and that she was only animated by the most sincere desire of living on good terms with the Confederation. And thirdly, Prussia had put her army on a war footing, taking this step in defence, and to watch over the European equilibrium. Lastly, the principles and the assurances contained in those declarations were entirely in harmony with the views of Russia.

"In the Congress, which Russia proposed, Great Britain drew out the bases, and Austria extended them. Its fundamental idea prejudiced no interests; on the one hand it touched no existing Italian territorial arrangement, on the other it admitted results of an admissible character. Such was the state of things when, at the last moment, when all difficulties of detail were surmounted, the Court of Vienna suddenly broke off the negotiation, on the single ground that in a congress, in which Italian States were to be discussed, Italian States should not be represented.

"It must be avowed that the French Government honestly seconded the powers who were desirous of peace.

"War having commenced, Russia's remaining duty was to circumscribe its range.

"In concurrence with Great Britain, she saw with regret the excitement of some parts of Germany. From fear of unfounded dangers, they were creating real ones. Passion imperilled their own internal peace, and affronted France, who had solemnly disclaimed hostile intentions.

"If further guarantee was necessary than the word of France, it was to be found in the attitude of Prussia, armed for the integrity of Germany and the balance of power.

"While other powers had wished to localise the war, the line followed by some of the states of the German Confederation was to generalise it. Independent of the slight cast upon the guarantees offered to Germany by the

positive declarations of the French government, and by the force of circumstances, the German states thereby deviated from their fundamental basis, which was that of a combination purely and exclusively defensive. It was on this condition that the Confederation had a European existence by treaties to which Russia had been partner. Should it take hostile measures against France, it would set conjectural data above guarantees. Whatever were the issue of the existing complications, the Emperor was perfectly free in his action."

13. *Attempt of France to re-assure England.*

Lord Cowley, our ambassador at Paris, writes to Lord Malmesbury, May 12, to inform him of an important message, which the Emperor had left for him during his accidental absence, when he himself was about to leave Paris for the seat of war. The following are extracts of Lord Cowley's despatch.

"His majesty had written to Count Walewski, charging him to assure me that his majesty's intentions were to localise the war as much as possible, to respect the neutrality of Germany, to give no countenance to any attempts at revolution, more especially with regard to Turkey, whose possessions on the Adriatic would be scrupulously respected, and to confine his military operations to driving the Austrians out of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. His majesty further declared that he would ever be ready to treat for peace, when suitable conditions were offered to him.

"I did not conceal from Count Walewski my apprehensions that the Emperor's programme could not be carried out. It was not likely," I said, "that Austria would consent to dispossess herself of her Italian possessions, until after a series of reverses which might bring the French troops under the walls of Vienna. Under such circumstances, I hardly needed to add that the war would not remain localised, or a purely Austrian and Italian war. Then again, with respect to the Emperor's intention to give no countenance to revolutions, but little attention would be paid to that assurance, so long as Sardinia, the

friend and ally of France, was acting in a diametrically contrary spirit. Nobody would believe that France could not prevent this. However, the Emperor's declaration with regard to Turkey would be received with satisfaction by her Majesty's Government, and I trusted that the French Government would exert the influence which they possessed over the Russian and Sardinian Governments to induce them to abstain from provoking complications in the East.

"Count Walewski replied that he had great hopes that the war would not be of long duration, and that a few months would see the end of it.

"With respect to the observations which I had made respecting the proceedings of Sardinia, he said that he coincided in them entirely, and that he had had a long conversation on this subject with the Emperor previous to his Majesty's departure; and that, with his Majesty's authorisation, he had written to Turin to say that Sardinia must renounce all kind of isolated action, and must, moreover, abstain from giving any encouragement whatever to the revolutionary party in Italy.

"Alluding to what I said with regard to Turkey, he observed that he had received the most unequivocal assurances from the Russian Government of their desire to see the tranquillity of Turkey maintained. He felt sure, therefore, that revolutionary movement in the Ottoman dominions would receive no encouragement from Russia.

"With regard to France, he assured me that the Imperial Government was most anxious that no cause of umbrage should be given to her Majesty's Government on any question regarding Turkey. M. de Thouvenel [the French ambassador at Constantinople] would receive the most positive instructions to act in complete concert with Sir Henry Bulwer, to consult him on every question which might arise, and on no account to separate himself from him. He would take Athens in his way to Constantinople, with the exclusive object of impressing on the Greek Government the necessity of abstaining from all intrigues to excite rebellion among the Greek subjects of the Porte.

"I cannot doubt, from Count Wa-

lewski's tone and language, that it is the sincere wish of the Imperial Government to prevent any question arising which could in any way occasion difference with her Majesty's Government.

"I took this opportunity of calling his attention to the language reported to be held by certain of the French representatives abroad. They already began to talk," I said, "of the treaties of 1815 being at an end. Such proceedings," I observed, "were not calculated to inspire confidence in the Emperor's intentions, and must necessarily cause great alarm in Europe.

"Count Walewski expressed surprise at what I told him, as he had lately sent circular instructions inculcating the greatest soberness of language."

14. *Public Opinion in England.*

The general feeling in England upon the breaking out of the war has been one of annoyance and disgust. Her people have been unable to take part with either side. Though Austria is, and has been, her natural ally, all parties concur in disliking the Austrian *régime*, condemning her encroachments in Italy, and abhorring her Italian policy. "It has been her attempt since 1815," said Lord John Russell in the House, on June 10, "to govern the whole of Italy, to make its sovereigns her viceroys, and to make its laws conform to her military law." Englishmen would be rejoiced, or relieved, at such a revision of the treaties of Vienna, with the consent of all parties, as would rid Italy of German domination. On the other hand, no one could deny that Lombardy and Venice were Austrian provinces by solemn treaties, which could not be violated without destroying the present European settlement, and which had actually imposed upon Austria the possession of a country which she had been very reluctant to accept. Moreover, she had accepted it from Europe in order that Europe might have a guarantee that Italy was secure from the invasion of France. At this moment, then, she was attacked in her Italian possessions by that very power, to resist whom in Italy those possessions were given to her in charge. It could not be denied that

Louis Napoleon's conduct was as unjust and insolent to Austria as his professions had been deceitful; but then Austria had been proud, obstinate, precipitate; and if this was all that had to be said on the subject, we suppose that the great mass of our people would have been out of humour, but would have been tolerably tranquil.

But it was impossible that considerations of a more practical and stimulating nature should long be away; and such have already made their appearance. A fanatical spirit, both in religion and politics, has made an appeal to the public in behalf of the French. Lord Shaftesbury has taken up Louis Napoleon, and has introduced him to Exeter Hall, as he had introduced Lord Palmerston before him, as a sort of elect champion destined to put down the Pope and the Catholic religion. Kossuth, on the other hand, has been attending public meetings in some of our great towns, recanting his hard words against the French Emperor, and making him the very Thalaba of the brood of Hapsburg and the avenger of Cæsarean Domdanielism. His philosophy and policy are summed up in one of his apophthegms at Manchester, not very religious, but flattering to the people whom he was addressing: "Let Austria be forsaken by England, and she will be forsaken by God."

Whatever influence these parallel efforts of very distinct interests in favour of the French Emperor might have had on the heart of England under other circumstances, at present there is a far more powerful principle in motion, and in an opposite direction,—the motive of personal and national security, which in its noblest form is patriotism. It has occurred to every one that the attack which Louis Napoleon has made on Austria might be as suddenly made on Great Britain; and if he has been able to make an Austrian war popular, it would be less difficult for him to recommend an English war to his subjects; and then the question rose at once, Are we in a condition to meet it? The hitherto irresistible force of the French armies is a great temptation to the sovereign possessing them, a temptation to themselves; in their strength and their consciousness of strength they

threaten no good to us. This led to the consideration of our home defences. We have thought of our firesides, of the beautiful face of our country, to which increase of years has but added grace and loveliness,—of our smiling hill and dale, and our ancestral parks and groves; and then again, of our metropolis, almost maritime, and our other great and prosperous towns, our docks, arsenals, and civil establishments. Statesmen have concealed this train of thought in the abstractions of diplomacy or politics, and have said that when great nations were at war, it was natural, becoming, and a duty, for neutral powers to arm in order that they may be respected; but it is obvious enough no one fears Austria, no one raises coast-guards, martello towers, or rifle corps against Austria: if, then, we are busy about these military matters, it must be in order to be safe against some other power or powers; and though Russia may be some such power, there is a certain power who has of late years been carefully augmenting her navy, and who has only last year ostentatiously shown us a wonderful harbour, the work of centuries, just now completed for the purposes of naval warfare, and just opposite our southern coast. And thus, in spite of Exeter Hall and Leicester Square, the national feeling has a greater jealousy of France than a hatred either of the Cæsar or the Pope.

What is said, what is believed, betray what is feared. Already there have been reports, which have attracted some attention, of two French war-steamer appearing outside Plymouth, and two others outside Falmouth. A schooner, too, of twelve guns, and a corvette of eighteen, were seen near the Eddystone lighthouse, in the run of the homeward-bound ships. Three French cruisers, too, have been watching the Irish coast from Cork to Cape Clear; and the newspapers, which mention these facts, are hard of belief that, after all, Austrian vessels are the prey which they are seeking. Moreover a statement appeared in the public prints, to the effect that the Russian and French governments had lately purchased Admiralty charts of all the British coasts to the value of above 1000*l.*, and that a similar order had just arrived from Spain, which included the coasts of India. It was

added, that no less than twenty-seven gun-boats of very light draft, besides vessels of larger size, were building in the Thames for the Spanish government; a government which has neither need nor money for such an armament, and which, in consequence, must be an agent, not a principal, in the transaction. As to the public prints generally, the French journals are severe upon England, and the English upon Louis Napoleon.

A deeper sentiment has lain at the bottom of these apprehensions. England is, after all, a monarchical and aristocratic country; and on this account, even putting aside the tie of kindred, she has a host of sympathies with Austria and Germany, which she cannot interchange with revolutionised, anarchical France. The leanings of the court are said, not unnaturally, to be German; and when Germany itself, ordinarily so phlegmatic and unexcitable, is in violent hostility to an un-English people, there is a twofold cause in operation, in spite of our desire to be neutral, for our bearing more patiently the bigotry of Austria than the ambition of her rival. Moreover, while no party among us has ever trusted Louis Napoleon, the great conservative body has actually distrusted him. In 1852 a panic spread among them that he was about to invade England, and that he had his men already shipped for our coasts. In 1854, when he was loyally engaged with us in the Russian war, the same feeling still smouldered in the breasts of country gentlemen and men of substance; and since the peace it has been ever getting more lively, if it has not yet burst out into a flame.

15. *Position of the Emperor Louis Napoleon.*

Louis Napoleon, elevated to the imperial throne by the suffrages of the whole French population, and in the teeth of the Congress of Vienna, could not really take his place among the old monarchical families of Europe, and be a partner to their treaties. His position was necessarily antagonistic to them from the first, and he was accepted by them only as the least of two evils—as the alternative and the destroyer of red republicanism. He was one whose very tenure of power was an infraction of the treaties of

Vienna, and whose recognition was both a precedent and an instrument of their abrogation. The name of Napoleon embodied many grave political principles, and the fact of prohibiting his family from the soil of France embodied others also. If he did not at once carry out the principles which he represented, it was because he did not feel it to be expedient. He was unfettered by engagements of any kind; and could consult, according to the best of his ability, the interests of Europe in the year 1859, that is so far as he had not bound himself by direct engagements to recognise the *status quo*.

Why he has changed his policy from one of peace to one of war, it is premature at this moment to attempt to determine. That he is in the hands of his army may be true, but he must have known his dependence on it at the time that he said, *L'Empire c'est la paix*. A persuasion has widely spread among all parties in England that, threatened with assassination by the Italian secret societies to which it is alleged he once belonged, and whose vengeance he invoked on admission in the event of his being unfaithful to their designs, he has had no alternative between loss of honour and life and the prosecution of Italian independence. No one can forget his publication of Orsini's testament in the *Moniteur*, in which a mention or suggestion was made, we forget in what terms, of the hopes which Italy had a right to place in the Emperor. From that time, it is said, the Austrian Government have considered war with the Bonaparte dynasty inevitable.

It is asserted at Vienna, according to a letter which has gone the round of the newspapers, that in 1830 Louis Napoleon and his brother were affiliated to the secret society of the Carbonari at Florence. The special Italian object of the Carbonari is the removal, at all hazards, of those Italian princes, ministers, police agents, and all other persons, who are averse to the union of Italy. With this view each Carbonaro takes a solemn oath of passive obedience to his superiors, who have the power to direct his dagger against all parties and persons indiscriminately, and even without the necessity

of giving any previous explanation. The oath of the Carbonari is irremissible, and implies for every renegade the certitude of being assassinated by the faithful. The two princes took an active part in the troubles of Romagna, from whence the Austrian letter-writer concludes that they seriously adhered to the tenets of the Carbonari; although he admits that Napoleon III. has for ever broken the ties that bound him to their revolutionary and secret society. The generous support afforded by him to the Pope, and many similar acts, evidently prove that if, during the time he could only be considered as a mere pretender to the throne, the successor of Napoleon I. thought proper to avail himself of the Carbonari, the sentiments he now professes must be most hostile to his former allies and associates. But the Carbonari are by no means disposed to liberate him from his vow. They still consider him as belonging to themselves; and they moreover believe that, if pressed, he will second their views, if not by his own free will, at least from the dread of a violent death, which they keep continually hovering over him. The attempt of Orsini and others against the life of the Emperor Napoleon III. was nothing more than the mere exercise of an acquired right, after numerous but vain remonstrances made by a Carbonari chief and his proselytes to a renegade brother. This horrible event modified the temper and habits of the Emperor to such an extent, as to admit no doubt of the dread he entertains for his dynasty hereafter in the event of the recurrence of similar events. The publishing of Orsini's will in the *Moniteur*, by order of Napoleon III., was equivalent to his saying to the Carbonari: "Suspend your attempts against my life; and let this act on my part be a pledge that I shall keep my engagements by contributing towards the emancipation of Italy." In this publication the Carbonari recognise a formal promise on the part of Napoleon III. to observe his oath, upon the condition that they cease to conspire against his life; or otherwise how explain the words of the *Unione* of Turin, the official organ of the Piedmontese Carbonari, when that paper observes: "Napoleon III.,

as Orsini's executor, must observe his oath; if he delayed in doing so, shells and daggers would accomplish their mission"? And does not the fact that the number of the *Unione* in which was published this awful warning, together with the official statement of the conditions implicitly accepted as compensation for this monstrous respite of the Carbonari, had freely circulated all through France,—does not this fact sufficiently justify the fears attributed to the Emperor in connection with their society?

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that he assigns a clear and intelligible reason for his present line of action in the various documents to which the quarrel with Austria has given rise. "Austria,"—as he represents to the court of London by his minister, April 26, — "not content with the position assigned to her in the North of Italy by the treaties of 1815, has wished to secure a preponderating influence in the whole Peninsula, and has forced its separate states into private engagements with her which endanger their independence. Sardinia alone has successfully resisted. Her cause is that of France, from her proximity to France; but it is the cause of Europe too, as much for the sake of the European equilibrium as of the treaties on which that equilibrium is based." Moreover it must be borne in mind, that in the celebrated pamphlet noticed in our number for May, he considers himself following the course of French policy which has been pursued since the days of Henry IV.; and it is remarkable, that this idea has been familiar to his mind, at least from the date of his captivity at Ham in 1844. From his prison he wrote as follows:

"To establish peace on a sound basis is a very different thing from keeping up a fictitious tranquillity for a few years. To do so, it is requisite to endeavour to bring about a cessation of hatred between nations, by favouring the tendencies and interests of each people; it is requisite to create an equitable equilibrium for each of the great powers; it is requisite, in a word, to follow the policy of Henri Quatre, and not the disastrous course pursued by the Stuarts and Louis Quinze. Open Sully's *Memoirs*, and see what were the great ideas of

the man who had pacified France and founded religious liberty. To establish on a solid basis the equilibrium of Europe, Henri Quatre thought it requisite that all the nations composing the great European family should be equal in power, and that no nation should be able to preponderate over another. He foresaw that for peoples, as for individuals, equality could alone be the source of justice. Henry IV. had brought round the greater part of Europe to his own views on this point; and when the dagger of the assassin brought his life to a termination, he was assembling a mighty army, composed of European contingents, having in view, not barren conquest, but universal peace, to attain which it was necessary to compel Spain (the house of Austria) to recognise the equality and independence of nations; and he would have established an areopagus, intended to decide by argument, and not by brute force, the quarrels between nations. Henri Quatre, had he lived, might have been named the Hero of Peace."

What is the most interesting point to Catholics is, the policy which the Emperor intends in future to pursue towards the Holy See. He has announced this policy in some of the state papers which have been given to the reader above; but, considering that he has the reputation of singular fixedness in his views (of which the quotation from the Ham letter is an instance), we think it important to set down the two principal professions on the subject which he has made on former occasions.

In August 1849, when President of the Republic, he wrote his famous letter to Edgar Ney, in which he said that the Republic had not sent an army into Italy to stifle liberty, but to regulate it, viz. by restoring to the Pontifical throne the Prince who first placed himself at the head of useful reforms; and that these reforms were, a general amnesty, secularisation of the administration, the Code Napoléon, and a liberal government, under the temporal power of the Pope.

In the Conference of Paris on the Peace in April 1856, the French Minister, M. Walewski, declared that France had a double motive to defer, together with Austria, to the request of the Pope for military assistance,

—as a Catholic and as a European power. The title of “eldest son of the Church,” of which the Sovereign of France is so proud, and the tranquillity of the Roman States, on which depends that of all Italy, and thereby the maintenance of order in Europe, claimed of the Emperor that service. On the other hand, he could not be blind to the abnormal condition of a power which, to maintain itself, requires the aid of foreign troops.

To these must be added his pamphlet of February last, in which he enters into the subject at great length. In one passage, apparently alluding to the case of the Jew boy Mortara, he speaks of canon law as being almost as immutable as dogma. “The laws of the Church,” he observes, “did not admit of discussion; they merited respect, and they ought to be considered as emanations of Divine wisdom: nevertheless civil society had its proper legislation as well as the religious polity.” It also observed that the absolutely clerical character of the Roman Government was *un contre-sens*, an active cause of discontent, an element of weakness, a permanent threat of revolution. For what more he has said in that pamphlet we must refer the reader to our May Number.

16. *State of France.*

The French people are said to have been in the first instance averse to the war; but, after it had once begun, to have undergone a change of feeling, and now to take a warm interest in a contest which supplies the excitement of a game of chance, and rouses those keener sentiments of national honour and glory to which no people are more alive than the French. We shall not attempt to prove what is so very probable; but as to evidences of the fact, we may refer, as regards the country at large, to the success of the war-loan. The government proposed to raise twenty millions sterling; the appeal has been answered by subscriptions to the amount of ninety-two millions, upon which a sum of above nine millions is forthcoming as a deposit. Moreover, of the whole sum a sixth part is made up of shares of ten francs each, showing the popularity of the Government

with the working-classes. Speaking of these results, the Minister of Finance says, in his report to the Emperor, “Obtained under existing circumstances, and immediately after food, monetary, commercial, and political crises, which have disturbed the world, and caused the strongest positions to totter, they bring out in strong relief the solidity of our financial system, the wealth of our country, and her power and patriotism. They show to every eye the close union which exists between France and the Emperor, the entire confidence of the nation in the force and wisdom of the Sovereign who presides over its destinies, and the security inspired by the temporary power confided to the firmness and the exalted intelligence of the Empress Regent.”

For the state of feeling in Paris, we may refer to the scene which took place on Louis Napoleon's leaving the metropolis for the seat of war, on May 10. “Before the departure of the Emperor,” we are told, “Prince Jerome and all the members of the imperial family, the ministers of state, and many personal and particular friends of his Majesty, proceeded to the Tuileries, about four o'clock, to bid farewell to the Emperor and console the Empress. His Majesty, I was told by one present, preserved his usual calm and confident aspect, saying a kind word to all who approached.” When at length he left the palace, “the crowds, the cheering, the patriotic songs, broken by repeated cries of *Vive l'Empereur!* all gave the most effectual contradiction to the reports of the war being unpopular with the bulk of the people. All progress along the Rue de Rivoli, down which the *cortège* moved at a slow pace, was impossible. The crowd along the foot-paths was wedged so close together, that women had to be extricated in a fainting state. The windows of the tall houses in the Rue de Rivoli and the very roofs were black with human beings. The Emperor was seated in an open carriage with the Empress, the usual escort of Cent Gardes following and preceding. As it moved out of the gates of the Carrousel, there was a roar of voices, hats were tossed aloft in the air, handkerchiefs were waved, and women cried.

The Emperor looked surprised at the unusual warmth of his reception, and well he might. It was the grand spectacle of a population of a great city, moved by a feeling of sincere and genuine enthusiasm, giving vent to their feelings in their own rough and imposing manner. There was no display of troops. By the time the *cortège* had arrived at the Hôtel de Ville, this continued and unexpected ovation had produced the effect which such an imposing manifestation must produce upon the most inflexible. The Emperor ordered his guards to move out of the way, and the carriage was instantly hemmed round by the enthusiastic crowds. I am told by an eye-witness, that the stern unbending features of Louis Napoleon were quivering with emotion, while the Empress was weeping without any attempt at concealment. He put his hands out of the carriage; and it was a sight indeed to see these rough *ouvriers*, these barricade-makers of the Rue St. Antoine, bending over and kissing them, and shouting *Vive l'Empereur!* When the *cortège* resumed its march, a band of workmen stood between the imperial carriage and the Cent Gardes, and preceded it all the rest of the way, singing the *Chant du Départ* of the Girondins, and even the *Marseillaise*; to the sounds of which, with *Vive l'Empereur!* for a burden, the imperial party alighted, and Napoleon III. set forth on his journey to the army of Italy."

The middle class, as represented by the Paris tradesmen, and the clergy, are said to be indisposed to the war. As to the clergy, it would not be fair to select that most revered prelate the Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons as their representative; but as it is the only pastoral which we happen to have seen, we quote the words of his Eminence. The Minister of Public Worship had requested "public prayers, beseeching the Almighty to vouchsafe the *success* of our arms and to protect France." The Archbishop responds thus: "Amid the grave circumstances in which France is placed, the first thought of the clergy is to turn towards God, who holds in His hands the hearts of kings, and who raises or *casts down empires* as He pleases. War, whatever may be the degree of glory to which it may raise

a nation, is always a *great scourge*. We cannot regard the misfortunes it occasions without *praying* Divine Providence to *abridge and put an end to them*. Accordingly, dear brethren, we shall extend towards heaven supplicating hands to implore its succour, and to *obtain a prompt and honourable peace*; and we shall repeat these words of the Minister of Public Instruction—"May God protect France and the Emperor!" In like manner, his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Bourges tells his clergy, "The Empire is peace. We must always be convinced of this great truth, even when war has become a painful necessity."

The Minister of Public Worship has also explained to the Bishops the necessity, or rather the unavoidable-ness, of the war. "The Italian question might have been solved peaceably," he said; "Austria assumes the terrible responsibility of events. Enlighten the clergy on the consequences of a now inevitable contest. The Emperor has thought on the subject in the presence of God; he will fail in nothing due either to religion or the country. He restored the Holy Father to the Vatican. It is his will that the Supreme Chief of the Church should be respected in all his rights as a temporal sovereign. He has saved France from demagoguery; he will not allow it in Italy. He thinks it best for Italy to establish the independence and liberty of its governments, and their non-interference with lawful social progress."

17. *State of Italy.*

First, we will set down a few details taken from the statistics of Italy, as given in the *Annuario* for 1858. The population of Italy amounts to 27,107,047 inhabitants. 19,913,304 souls are under Italian governments, and 7,193,743 obey foreign rule. Italy is one of the countries in which the largest cities and towns are to be found, nineteen of them having more than 50,000 inhabitants, and eight—Rome, Naples, Palermo, Venice, Florence, Milan, Genoa, and Turin—exceed 100,000. Almost all the population are Catholics. The births far exceed the deaths; the increase in the population is particularly remark-

able in Sicily and Tuscany, where it may double in seventy-three years. Italy alone has very nearly one-half as many bishoprics as there are in the whole of Europe; 256 out of 535. The regular and secular clergy of both sexes count in Italy 189,000, and they are, as compared with the numbers of the population, as 1 to 142. The clergy are more numerous in Sicily than in any other part of Italy, or perhaps in the world, the number of priests, monks, or nuns, being 33,266, or one out of sixty-nine inhabitants. There are nearly 300 journals published in Italy; of which number 117 are in the Sardinian States, which contain one-fifth of the total population. One of the principal branches of industry is the production of silk, and in ordinary years the value of that article is from 8,000,000*l.* to 9,000,000*l.* Lombardy alone, which is only the fifteenth part of Italy, produces one-third. Commerce is active; but business is said to be impeded by the high tariffs in many of the states, and by the lines of custom-houses. The mercantile marine of Italy is more numerous, in proportion to the extent of country, than that of any other nation in Europe, England excepted.

And next we set down some chief particulars, for we have not room for detail, of the treaties, so often alluded to in the diplomatic correspondence before the commencement of the war, which exist between Austria and the Italian States. By the treaty between Austria and Modena of 1847, the two powers bind themselves to lend each other help and assistance in the event of "an attack from without;" and the Emperor further promises to lend every military assistance necessary for the maintenance and reëstablishment of "tranquillity and legal order" in the interior of the states of the Duke of Modena. A similar treaty, *mutatis mutandis*, was concluded between Austria and Parma in February 1848. Austria has, by the treaty of Vienna, the right of placing garrisons at Ferrara and Comacchio. Austria and Tuscany agreed to combine to prevent the peace of Italy from being disturbed. The Emperor engaged to furnish at least 80,000 men of all arms for that purpose, and the Grand Duke 6000. By the treaty between Austria

and Naples of April 1815, it is stipulated in a secret article that "the king of the Two Sicilies shall not admit any changes which are incompatible either with monarchical institutions, or with the principles adopted by his Imperial Majesty for the internal *régime* of his Italian provinces."

As to the state of feeling of the Italian populations at the existing crisis, but one opinion prevails among the English public, which we have no means of saying is not founded on fact. There is in certain classes of the nation great discontent and restlessness, based on the feeling that Italy is behind the world in social and municipal respects. If they are educated, and employ their minds, they are either infidels, or at least speak with great disrespect of the ecclesiastical *régime*. They wish for revolution, if not for its own sake, at least as a necessary preliminary to reform and advance. Numbers of them are affiliated to secret societies. However, whatever their discontent, they are not equally desirous that the French should take the place of the Austrians, but they desire "Italy for the Italians." At the moment, however, the advantage of French intervention is present, and the danger future.

(1) Rome.

We shall learn the views of the Pontifical Government from a despatch of the English agent at Rome to Lord Malmesbury. He says, on March 15, "I called this morning on Cardinal Antonelli, and said, 'Your Eminence is already aware that Lord Cowley was sent to Vienna by her Majesty's Government, who earnestly desire the maintenance of peace in Europe, to ascertain whether the relations between France and Austria could be put on a better footing. Now her Majesty's Government consider three points essential to the maintenance of peace in Italy, the execution of which would, in their opinion, remove all pretexts for war. These points are:

"1. That Austria should bind herself not to attack Sardinia; and,

"2. That she should concert with France on the best and safest manner of evacuating the Pope's territory.'

"Here the Cardinal interrupted me,

and said, 'Austria can have no difficulty in agreeing to the first point, for she never had the slightest intention or desire to attack Sardinia. Respecting the second point she has no choice. I have, as you already know, addressed an official note to the ambassadors of France and Austria, in which I ask for the withdrawal of the troops of occupation in the name of the Pope; and I have requested they would do so in the course of the present year. Their place will be supplied by our own troops, and by a new battalion of riflemen which I am organising. Our army, when complete, is to consist of nearly 18,000 men.'

"I said, 'As your Eminence has anticipated Austria, and agreed to the first two points, I now come to the third—that Austria should advise and support reforms in the Papal States, on the basis she proposed in 1831 and 1857.'

"His Eminence said, 'We have our laws, and it is our duty to maintain and execute those laws. The promises made by the Pope at Gaeta will be strictly carried out. It is true that the municipal elections and certain administrative subdivisions in the Legations are not yet in force; and the cause of this delay must be sought in the past state of the country and the presence of foreign troops. Every thing, I repeat it, granted by the Pope at Gaeta will be executed as soon as our hands are free to act. The first step towards that end was taken, you know it, by our request for the withdrawal of the foreign garrison; the rest will follow gradually, according to the state of the country.'

It is said that the French Emperor has made his general at Rome responsible for the safety of the Pope, the Sacred College, and the diplomatic body. We are told, moreover, by the Archbishop of Dublin in his recent pastoral, that promises have been made the Holy Father of the most decided character that his states shall not be interfered with. It was not unnatural that the populace should show some signs of agitation, considering what events were in progress at Easter time; but the French general suppressed them. The French soldiers are said to have taken possession of S. Pietro in Montorio, which com-

mands the whole of Rome. Even Louis Napoleon cannot promise to control the political events which he has set in motion; else, as far as he is concerned, we do not see any reason to doubt he means to treat the Pope as becomes the eldest son of the Church. It is said that, when the French ambassador declared Louis Napoleon's intention to defend his person and rights, he turned to a crucifix, and said, "Monsieur le Duc, that is what I confide in." This is nothing else but the act of faith and hope under all circumstances; but, at least at the beginning of his reign, Pius had a considerable liking for the French, and probably has still.

Since this has been written, the public has had some distinct information of the relations subsisting between the Holy See and the French Government. On May 17 Cardinal Antonelli told the English Government Agent at Rome how much the Pope had been gratified by the "repeated assurances which his Holiness had received from France that no event in the future should interfere with the peace and quiet of Rome;" and we are informed by Lord Cowley that on the Duc de Grammont, the French ambassador at Rome, leaving the Holy City for Alessandria in the course of the same month, "he was the bearer of an autograph letter of the Pope to his Majesty, in which his Holiness repeated the assurances already given under another form to the French Government, that he considered himself safe under the protection of France, and had no intention of quitting Rome."

If the Pope has to fear France, he has also to complain of Austria. This latter power, with a view of meeting, as it would appear, the projected attack of the French fleet in the Adriatic, declared Ancona to be in a state of siege, extinguished the light in the lighthouse at the entrance of the harbour, and landed there a force of many thousand men, 6000 to 10,000, with 5000 tons of *matériel* of war, and provision for six months: 700 men were employed on making an entrenched camp. The Pope protested, the French remonstrated, and the Austrians were obliged to relinquish a course of proceeding which would have compromised the Pope's neutrality.

At this most awful moment, his Holiness has not been wanting to his apostolic mission, but has addressed an encyclical letter to all the Catholic Bishops, desiring them to order public prayers for peace, and attaching indulgences to their use.

(2) *Lombardy.*

Sir J. Hudson, our Minister at Turin, writes to Lord Malmesbury in the beginning of January: "Seven years of bad wine crops, silk crops, and corn crops, with heavy taxation, have reduced the northern Italians to skin and bone. Any traveller must have remarked the rags of the peasant, the worn-out horses and carts, and the absence of gentlemen's equipages at the Corsos of Milan, Brescia, Verona, and Bologna. And the Sardinian Government know as well as I do, that if they cross the Ticino, they will find empty treasuries, a famished people, and, comparatively speaking, few resources."

(3) *Tuscany and the Duchies.*

A revolution in Tuscany was one of the earliest and easiest events of the war, April 25. It took place before the manifestoes, and was done and over almost as soon as it was begun. There was a rising in the morning, and in the afternoon the Grand Duke was escorted by a guard of honour to the frontiers *en route* for Bologna. The army turned against him. Then the King of Sardinia was chosen Dictator; and, on his declining the responsibility for political reasons, matters went into confusion.

The revolution would seem to be popular, to judge by the relation of a Catholic who was passing from Rome northwards at the time. "At Viterbo," in the Roman States, he says, "the tricolor was partially displayed; but in the Tuscan dominions it burst upon us, high up on church-steeple and chimney-tops, out of windows and at door-ways, in forms of flowers stuck in the bonnet, in ribbons on the breast, and in bannerets from donkey-carts. The entire population have surrendered their men for the public service, feeling that it is Italy's hour."

Massa and Carrara have revolted from the Duke, and the King of Sar-

dinia has annexed them to his dominions.

Parma, after some vacillation, has declared for the allies; and the Duchess Regent has released the troops from their allegiance to her, and has left for Switzerland.

(4) *Naples.*

The only event of importance in the Neapolitan dominions has been the death of the king, which took place on May 22. As far as information goes at present, the new king has ascended the throne without disturbance. It is said that the French asked for the occupation of three ports,—one in Sicily, two on the main land; the Neapolitan government answered that they were not in a condition to resist the French if they took them, but that it was against the rights of nations.

(5) *Sardinia.*

As to Sardinia, it is a question whether the war and the policy of government are popular except in that active and influential portion of the nation which depends on the minister. The clergy, from the history of late years, the country people, from the sufferings which war inflicts on them, would seem to be opposed to it. Lord Normanby has said in the House of Lords that, while the taxation in the Duchy of Parma was only eight per cent, and that in Modena still less, the taxation in Sardinia was fifty-five per cent. Accordingly, allowing for exaggeration, we are not indisposed to acquiesce in the report given us by the *Times* correspondent on the feelings with which the Austrians were received by the Sardinian peasantry. Speaking of the rapid rise of the Sesia, he says that the loss which it would have occasioned the Austrians was prevented, owing to the voluntary exertions of the Piedmontese labourers. He continues, "This circumstance clearly proves how untrue are the statements made about the animosity of the Italians against the Austrians. I have myself been only three days in Piedmont on this occasion; but I have already ridden 140 miles, and stopped at nearly every village; and to an Englishman the natives would not conceal their feelings. I can assure you that their anger is all

against their own government, not for this war merely, but for the whole policy of overloading them with taxes, such as our exploded window-tax and a tax on carriages, for the purpose of keeping up an army beyond the wants of the country. I speak of the peasantry; the burghers and lawyers may think differently. When the Austrians arrived at a certain town, the inhabitants reproached them much for not coming a fortnight sooner. Expecting them, they said, they had made every excuse to delay providing their quota of the reserve of the army. The Piedmontese had carried off nearly all the horses and provisions from this part of the country. At Stroppiana they even carried off the women to work at Casale. The Austrians sent provisions for the starving inhabitants left there."

On the other hand, after the ill-success of the Austrian army, an Austrian officer accounted for it, in the report of his conversation given in the public prints, by saying, "During the whole campaign, the great difficulty which the Austrians have had to contend with, was want of intelligence of the movements of the allies. Neither money nor threats could induce the country people to divulge any thing. They never could make out where the chief force of the allies was. They had to feel their way, and go to and fro like blind men." Is it possible that the conduct of a portion of the Austrian soldiers in Piedmont might have caused a change of feeling?

18. *Alliances, Neutralities, and Armaments.*

The result of the universal commotion which the war has caused among the nations of Europe is this:

An understanding, not an alliance, exists between France and Russia, having reference, not to the East, but to Italy.

An alliance, at first announced as defensive, but now allowed to be offensive and defensive, exists between France and Sardinia.

It has been surmised that there is some kind of understanding between France and Spain. The troops of the two powers have been lately, or are now, engaged together in a military

expedition in Cochin China. Mention has been made above of gunboats for shallow waters building in English docks, ostensibly for Spain. The Spanish journals are talking of taking or purchasing Gibraltar. Portugal proposes to Spain an alliance with herself; Spain is said to have answered that the political connection between Portugal and England forbade it.

Here, however, there are contrary reports. It is said that the anti-French spirit of the country is rising to the surface rapidly. A paper in the French interest has suggested that the Pope ought to be brought for safety to the Balearic Islands; and that, in order to protect him, the islands might be intrusted to a French garrison. Now the French have always had a hankering after those islands; and since the conquest of Algeria their hankering has increased twenty-fold, because without those islands in their hands Algeria cannot be defended against a maritime power. This is well known in Spain, and the recommendation has been answered by a universal shout of indignation. Moreover the principal newspapers, those belonging to the *moderado* party, always known as the "French party," have now turned entirely Austrian.

There was a report, at the time when the existence of the Russo-French alliance was first spoken of, that Denmark had joined it. This was promptly denied on authority.

Some sort of alliance has been contemplated between Holland and Belgium. They were said to have agreed on raising a joint army, Belgium contributing the greater portion of it, and Holland providing a fleet.

The neutral powers are England, Spain, Portugal, Rome, Naples, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Denmark.

Prussia and the German Confederation, Russia, and Turkey, have not yet taken their places in the European complication.

Much might be said on the armaments of the several states, but it is sufficient to say that the whole of Europe may be considered to be under arms.

As to Spain, in case of a war with France, the guerillas will form the main strength of that country. The regular army is said to be inefficient on

the score of armament. With respect to artillery, the Spanish foundries produce serviceable pieces, and are in a position to supply all the wants of the country. They are experimenting there just now on a new sort of rifled cannon. As to fortifications, the old walls of Cadiz are being looked to, and enormous Paixhans mounted thereon. The powerful and new fortifications of La Mola, in the Balearic Islands, are carried on with great activity. A small squadron is also preparing to cruise between the Balearic Islands and Italy.

The German preparations are as follows. Powerful armies are contemplated for the Rhine. Prussia is to provide for the defence of the lower part of the river, and the secondary states for that of the upper. Austria is to send twenty regiments of cavalry. The reserves in Prussia and Silesia have already joined their regiments; the Landwehr is to be called out when danger is imminent. All the federal fortresses have been put in a state of defence. A corps of 10,000 men defends the Diet at Frankfort. At Coblenz the outworks of the fortresses are prepared for attack, and provision for six months laid in. The horses for the artillery are purchased. Supplies for six months have also been sent to Luxemburg. Mayence has 27,000 men. Bavaria has from 80,000 to 100,000 ready to march. 170,000 men are spoken of for the army of observation; but from 300,000 to 400,000 men, or even 500,000, as the Germans say, are forthcoming.

One state seems to have made no extraordinary preparations, if its defenders and friends are to be believed. This state, strange to say, is France. When invited by the British Government to take her part in the general disarmament, she replied that she had never armed; an answer which we did not record in its proper place, because, though it is certain that she said that the business going on in her dockyards was merely the substitution of new material for that which the recent scientific inventions had superseded, we had not found any official report of the assertion as put forward in answer to an invitation to disarm. "As regards France," said a French paper high in imperial favour, "she has no occasion to dis-

arm, for the simple reason that she has no extraordinary armament. She has marched no troops to her frontiers; she has not even used her right to respond to the threats of Austria. It cannot be a question whether of reducing a single effective soldier from her army or of taking a single additional cannon into her arsenals. She can but make an engagement not to arm." In another number: "She is still on a peace footing. She has formed no camp; she has collected no army on her frontiers; she has not applied to the legislature for a war credit."

What makes this still more remarkable is a passage in one of Lord Malmesbury's despatches to Lord Cowley, dated January 10. "I am aware," he writes, "from a conversation which Lord Clarendon held lately at Compiègne with the Emperor, and which his Lordship repeated to me, that his Imperial Majesty has *long looked at* the internal state of Italy with interest and anxiety. It may be that he imagines that in *a war with Austria*, and having Sardinia for an ally, he *may play the important part* of regenerator of Italy."

19. *Armed Neutrality of England.*

As to our own country, immense stores of ammunition have been conveyed to Corfu, Malta, and Gibraltar. Without interfering with the Channel fleet, the Malta squadron has been doubled. It is said to consist of thirteen sail of the line, besides frigates and smaller vessels. The defences of Gibraltar having been considered behind the advance of military science, the old guns are replaced by large Armstrong guns.

A royal proclamation has been issued for receiving additional seamen. Upwards of 10,000 men presented themselves for enlistment in a very short time.

The Government has issued a circular, addressed to the Lord-Lieutenants of counties, on the subject of volunteer rifle and artillery corps. This measure has a reference to the danger of invasion. The conditions are to be such as the following: the oath of allegiance is to be taken; the corps to be liable to be called out; when under arms, military law to be

enforced; the members to receive pay; provision to be made for those who are disabled in active service, or their widows, if they are killed. Twenty-four days drill in the year. Members to find their own arms and equipments.

20. *Strength of the Armies in the Field.*

Under date of May 16, the *Times* correspondent, writing from Turin, supplies the following estimate:

At that date the Piedmontese, at a very liberal estimate, were 80,000 effective men, including 10,000 or 12,000 volunteers, and Garibaldi's 3,000. Another corps was in process of formation, which would probably amount to 3,000 more.

The general belief was, that at the date named there were 130,000 French in the Sardinian States. The French were still deficient in cavalry, artillery, and camp-equipage. At Lyons a tremendous siege-train was preparing against the Lombard fortresses. Thus the total of the allies in the middle of May was 210,000 men.

As to the Austrians, they might be considered 220,000, of which there were at Ancona 7,000, and Ferrara 4,000. At Venice 12,000 to 15,000. At Verona 6,000, Mantua 4,000, Peschiera 2,000, and Legnano 1,000—that is, 13,000 in the quadrangle fortresses. At Brescia, Milan, Bergamo, and Cremona, 20,000 to 25,000. At Piacenza 25,000, and at Pavia 5,000. In Piedmont somewhere about 130,000.

We may fitly add to the above an account of the German and non-German provinces of the Austrian Empire.

The population of the Empire is 37,000,000. It consists of the Italian provinces, 5,000,000; Hungary and its dependencies, 14,500,000; Poland, 5,000,000; and German provinces, 12,500,000.

The German provinces, of course, are the only portion of the Empire which forms part of the Confederation, and is placed under the guarantee of the federal compact. They are the Archduchy of Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Salzburg, the Tyrol, Carinthia, Styria, and Carniola, and some outlying territories, of which the most prominent is Trieste and its

vicinity. The non-German provinces are Galicia, the Bukovina, Hungary, Transylvania, Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, a part of Istria, and Lombardy.

21. *First Movements and Plans of the Austrians.*

Field-Marshal Gyulai, in the first week of April, in the immediate prospect of crossing the Ticino, addressed his troops as follows:

"Soldiers,—His majesty the Emperor summons you under the colours to humble, for the third time, the pride of Piedmont, and to clear out the nest of fanatics and of subverters of the general tranquillity of Europe.

"Soldiers of every grade, advance against an enemy who has ever fled before you.

"Remember only Volta, Sommacampagna, Curtatone, Montanara, Rivoli, Santa Lucia, and, a year later, La Cava, Vigevano, Mortara, and, finally, Novara, where you dispersed and annihilated him.

"It is unnecessary to recommend to you discipline and courage; in the first you are unequalled in Europe, and in the second surpassed by none.

"Let your rallying cry be, 'Long live the Emperor and our good right!'"

The negotiations lasted through April; on the 23d was sent the famous *ultimatum*, which assigned the 26th for the commencement of the war, in the event of its being rejected.

Meanwhile the last effort of the English ministry delayed the passage of the Ticino till the 29th. The invading commander's plan is said to have been to strike a blow either at Turin or Novi.

The French were taken by surprise by the abrupt termination of the negotiations. They had not completed the preparations necessary for their artillery; and the pass of Mount Cenis, still encumbered with hard or melting snow, was impracticable for heavy carriages. It was apparently a race between French and Austrian, and the Austrian had the start.

But rains set in heavily on the 4th of May, and the whole plain within the Ticino, partly flooded by the full torrents pouring down from the Alps, and partly by the artificial means at

the disposal of the Sardinians, became impassable.

The rains continued for at least a month with little intermission. On the 15th a correspondent of the London papers writes, "The belligerent armies are camping, bivouacking, marching, and countermarching in slush and mud. The ground, already unfitted by the previous rains and inundations for active operations, must offer insuperable obstacles to the movements of any but the lightest artillery.

Another says, "The fields are utterly impassable, except for infantry; and even that arm could not move across country except by short and slow marches. Every field is bounded by a ditch full of water, with a hedge of trees about two feet apart on each side of it; and fully one-fourth of the country is under water entirely."

A third letter states that the Austrian commanders had bitterly complained of the interference of the British diplomatists at the very last moment. Lord Malmesbury did serious injury to Austria by making on the 25th of April the proposition which was accepted by Count Buol and rejected by M. de Walewski. On the 26th of April Count Gyulai was to have crossed the Ticino: and his plan of operation was to send the one-half of his army in forced marches to Novi, in order to destroy the two railroads which there join; the other half was to advance towards Casale. As the weather was fine until the 4th of May, the Austrians would (had they crossed the Ticino on the appointed day) have had but little difficulty in making their way to Novi. In the evening of the 29th of April the advanced guard entered Sardinia, and an attempt was even then made to get to Novi.

22. *Position of the Sardo-French Forces.*

The Emperor Louis Napoleon left Paris on the 10th of May, leaving the Empress as regent; on his arrival at Genoa, he issued the following order of the day:

"To the Army of Italy.

"Soldiers,—I come to place myself at your head, to conduct you to the combat. We are about to second the struggles of a people now vindicating its independence, and to rescue it from

foreign oppression. This is a sacred cause, which has the sympathies of the civilised world. I need not stimulate your ardour. Every step will remind you of a victory.

"In the Via Sacra of ancient Rome, inscriptions were engraved upon the marble, reminding the people of their exalted deeds. It is the same to-day. In passing Mondovia, Marengo, Lodi, Castiglioni, Arcole, and Rivoli, you will, in the midst of those glorious recollections, be marching in another Via Sacra.

"Preserve that strict discipline which is the honour of the army here. Forget it not, there are no other enemies than those who fight against us in battle. Remain compact, abandon not your ranks to hasten forward. Beware of a great enthusiasm, which is the only thing I fear.

"The new *armes de précision* are dangerous only at a distance. They will not prevent the bayonet from being what it has hitherto been—the terrible weapon of the French infantry.

"Soldiers,—Let us all do our duty, and put our confidence in God. Our country expects much from you. From one end of France to the other the following words of happy augury re-echo, 'The new army of Italy will be worthy of her elder sister.'

"Given at Genoa, May 12, 1859."

The army had a double base of operation, Susa and Mount Cenis, and Genoa; the railroad through Turin and Alessandria connected the two. The Sardinian forces defended the line of the Dora Baltea from Ivrea to Chivasso in front of Turin, and the line of the Po from Casale to Valenga. The mass of the French army was collected about Alessandria, which was the head-quarters of Louis Napoleon; and stretched up to Valenga on the Po north, and to Casteggio eastward.

23. *Advance and Retreat of the Austrians.*

The Austrians, in the aggregate 100,000 strong, entering Piedmont in three columns, advanced as far as Vercelli, or even Biella, on the north of the Po, and Tortona on the south. They attempted to pursue their western march. From Vercelli runs the Sesia southwards into the Po; cross-

ing then the Sesia at Vercelli, they advanced to Trino, and even to Crescentino, opposite to Chivasso, and not far from the junction of the Dora Baltea with the Po. Then they fell back again. Where the Sesia joins the Po the latter river changes its course, and runs south, as if in continuation of the Sesia. There, too, a second body of the army attempted to cross; but the floods would not allow it.

Meanwhile a third Austrian corps of 25,000 men to the east had crossed the Po southwards, and took possession of Stradella. Failing in the attempt to advance westward, they fortified the line of the Sesia. In the direction of Novi and Genoa, and to the south of the Po, they had advanced, as we have said, as far as Tortona; then they retired to Voghera, then to Casteggio, in the direction of Pavia, towards Stradella on the Po, where they were in force. These various movements occupied the first three weeks of the campaign.

24. *Engagement at Montebello.*

On May 20, the day three weeks after their entering Piedmont, the Austrians had a sharp engagement with the Sardo-French troops at Montebello, in the neighbourhood of Casteggio.

The French account is to the effect that the Austrians attacked the allies under Marshal Baraguay d'Hilliers with 15,000 men, and after an obstinate fight of four or five hours, were repulsed by a French division under General Ferey, with a loss of 2000, and 200 prisoners. The Piedmontese horse behaved with great gallantry. The Austrians crossed the river in their rear.

But the Austrians say that General Stadion sent out a reconnoitring party, to learn the strength and position of the enemy's right wing. Advancing towards Montebello, they met the French in great force, far greater than their own; and having effected their purpose of making the French develop their full force, made good their retreat.

25. *Advance and Success of the Allies.*

May 30, 31. The Sardinians, after a desperate conflict, crossed the Sesia,

and established themselves at Palestro, on the left bank. On this the Emperor Louis Napoleon left Alexandria for Vercelli. And then he suddenly brought up his whole army, by means of the railroad, from the neighbourhood of Voghera and Casteggio, on the Austrian left, where the enemy had found it at the engagement of Montebello, to their extreme right; and crossing the Sesia where the Sardinians had crossed it, he advanced to Mortara and Novara, the Austrians hastily retreating before them.

26. *Passage of the Ticino.*

June 3. The passage was effected by the French at Turbigo, the Austrians in vain opposing it from Buffalora.

27. *Battle of Magenta.*

The French Emperor's Account.—

June 4. At 11:30 a great victory was won at the Bridge of Magenta; 5000 prisoners were taken, and 15,000 of the enemy were killed or wounded.

June 5. We have taken 7000 prisoners; at least 20 000 Austrians are *hors de combat*. We have captured three guns and two standards. Our loss is about 3000 men and one gun; 323 killed, 2165 wounded, 470 missing.

Austrian Account.— June 5. Early yesterday a hot fight began at Magenta. The conflict was maintained with varying fortune all night.

June 18. Official. There were 63 officers and 1302 men killed, 218 officers and 4130 soldiers wounded, 4000 soldiers missing.

28. *Engagement at Marignano.*

Turin, June 8. Yesterday the allies won a fresh victory, driving the enemy from Marignano, where they had been entrenched.

The Austrians were 30,000 strong; they suffered a loss of 1500 killed and wounded and 1200 prisoners. The battle lasted nine hours. The French loss was 154 killed, 725 wounded, 64 missing.

Vienna. The Austrians at the battle of Marignano yielded only to the decidedly superior force of the enemy; and retired, unpursued, in perfect order.

29. *Hasty Retreat of the Austrians.*

French Emperor's Telegram.—June 6, 8 a.m. Milan is insurgent; the Austrians have evacuated the town and castle, leaving, in their precipitation, cannon and treasure of the army behind them. We are encumbered with prisoners, and have taken 12,000 Austrian muskets.

June 10. The Austrians have evacuated Pavia.

June 11. They have evacuated Piacenza, after blowing up the citadel and abandoning a great number of cannon and magazines full of provisions and ammunition. They have blown up the fortifications of Pizzighettone. They have retired from Lodi. The seat of government has been transferred to Mantua.

June 12. A part of the French army has passed the Adda without striking a blow. They are crossing the Oglio.

June 12. The Austrians have evacuated Ancona, Bologna, Ferrara. They have retired from the States of the Church.

June 13. The Austrians have evacuated Reggio, and are preparing to evacuate the rest of Modena.

30. *Change of Austrian Generalissimo.*

June 14. The official *Vienna Gazette* says, "The Emperor will forthwith assume the command-in-chief, and has ordered a new position for the army, which will be taken up in the best manner possible."

A council of war is said to have been held at Verona, and almost all the members expressed their disapproval of the dispositions of Count Gyulai on the 4th and 5th inst. The loudest railers are military men. General Count Schlick has taken the command of the second army, instead of General Gyulai.

31. *Risings of the Italians.*

Wherever the allied troops have shown themselves, the population of Lombardy has declared for them.

June 13. A deputation from Modena on the subject of annexation has arrived at Turin.

June 13. After the retreat of the Austrians from Bologna, the Cardinal Legate left the city, and Victor

Emmanuel was immediately proclaimed. The town is *en fête*.

June 15. The towns of Forli, Faenza, and Imola have proclaimed Victor Emmanuel king or dictator.

June 17. Rimini, Cesena, and Ravenna have pronounced for the national cause.

June 18. Perugia has pronounced, and the districts in the same neighbourhood on the right of the Tiber, and Citta di Castello on the left.

June 21. Fano, Urbino, Fossombrone, Sesi, and Ancona, have declared for the national cause.

32. *The Emperor Louis Napoleon's Proclamations from Milan.*(1) *To the People of Italy.*

"The fortunes of war bringing me into the capital of Lombardy, I come to tell you why I am here.

"When Austria made its unjust attack on Piedmont, I resolved to support my ally, the Sardinian king; the honour and interest of France made it a point of duty.

"Your foes (who are mine) have tried to lessen the universal sympathy all Europe felt in your cause by giving out that I only made war for personal ambition, or to aggrandise the French territory. If there are men who cannot understand the epoch they live in, I am not of that number.

"In a sound state of public opinion, at this time of day, men become greater by the moral influence they exert than by barren conquests. I seek with pride that moral influence, by contributing to render free the most beautiful land in Europe.

"Your welcome has proved that you fully understand me. I come not here with a pre-arranged plan to dispossess sovereigns, or to impose on you my will. My army will have two works to perform—fight your enemies and keep internal order. No obstacle shall be raised to the free manifestations of your legitimate wishes. Providence often favours nations, as it does individuals, by offering them the opportunity of sudden greatness; but it is on condition of their knowing how to avail themselves of it wisely. Earn, then, the boon now offered you. Your desire for independence, so long put forth, so often baffled, shall be real-

ised, if you show yourselves worthy of it. Unite, then, one and all, in one great object—the deliverance of your native land. Adopt military organisation; rally round the standard of King Victor Emmanuel, who has indicated to you so nobly the path of honour. Remember that without discipline there is no army; and, burning with the sacred fire of patriotism, be soldiers to-day, to become to-morrow free citizens of a great country.

“NAPOLEON.

“Given at Head-quarters, Milan, June 8, 1859.”

(2) *Proclamation to the Army of Italy.*

“Soldiers!—One month ago, relying confidently on the efforts of diplomacy, I still hoped for peace, when the sudden invasion of Piedmont by the Austrian troops called us under arms. We were not ready; men, horses, *matériel*, stores, were wanting; and we were compelled, in order to assist our allies, to debouch by small fractions beyond the Alps in presence of a formidable enemy long since prepared for the struggle.

“The danger was great; the energy of the nation and your own courage have supplied all deficiencies. France has found her olden virtues and has united for a single object, and in one sentiment she has shown the might of her resources and the strength of her patriotism. The operations commenced ten days ago, and the Piedmontese territory is already freed from its invaders.

“The allied army has been successful in four engagements and one decisive battle, which have opened the gates of the capital of Lombardy. You have put upwards of 35,000 Austrians *hors de combat*, taken 17 guns, 2 colours, 8,000 prisoners. But all is not over. There are more battles in store for us, more obstacles to overcome.

“I rely upon you. Courage, then, gallant soldiers of the army of Italy! From the heights of heaven your fathers proudly contemplate their children.

“NAPOLEON.

“From Head-quarters, Milan, June 8, 1859.”

33. *Proclamation of the King of Sardinia.*

The date would seem to be about June 8.

“People of Lombardy,—The victory of the arms of freedom leads me among you.

“Having regained your national rights, your votes confirm the union with my kingdom, which is founded on civil freedom.

“The temporary form of government which I give you to-day is required by the necessities of the war. Independence once secured, the mind will acquire composure, the soul virtue, and then will be founded a free and lasting government.

“People of Lombardy,—Those who dwell under the Alps have already made great sacrifices for our common country; our army, swelled with volunteers from your own and other provinces of Italy, has already given proofs of its valour, fighting victoriously for the national cause.

“The Emperor of the French, our generous ally, worthy of the name and genius of Napoleon, putting himself at the head of that great nation, wishes to make Italy free from the Alps to the Adriatic.

“Not minding sacrifices, you will second these magnanimous designs on the field of battle. You will show yourselves worthy of the destinies to which Italy is now called, after centuries of suffering.”

A decree for the provisional organisation of Lombardy follows.

34. *Message of the King of Sardinia to the Pope.*

Victor Emmanuel, in answer to the deputation from Bologna, has stated that he disapproves every act which menaces the Pope's temporalities. He has also sent a message to Rome, conveying the same message to the Holy Father, and telling him that he has nothing to fear from the cause of Italian Independence.